DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 814 SP 002 576

By-McGeoch, Dorothy M.; And Others

Function and Future: The Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin.

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Lab., Inc., St. Paul.
Spons Agency-Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Madison.
Pub Date Aug 68
Note-89p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.55
Descriptors-*Educational Change, *Laboratory Schools

This study of campus laboratory schools presents their development, status, problems, and future through an inventory of the nine schools associated with the state universities of Wisconsin. Information contributed by a survey of university faculty, campus school teachers, administrators, and public school personnel through questionnaires, discussions, and conferences as well as a review of recent national surveys and trends are presented. Six implications emerged from the study: the campus school exists to serve the institution of which it is a part: the Wisconsin campus schools are attempting to perform a variety of functions with insufficient resources: the functions of the campus school must be clearly defined in relation to the institution of which it is a part: it is unrealistic to consider closing the campus schools for reasons of economy: the development of cooperative programs with public school systems would ease the burden of campus schools: and the campus school should be maintained only so long as it can perform essential functions for the institution of which it is a part. Recommendations which grew out of these implications are intended to create a framework and plan for action. Appended are questionnaires which were used in the study. (SM)

ED029814

# FUNCTION AND FUTURE:

# THE PUBLIC CAMPUS

# LABORATORY SCHOOLS

# IN WISCONSIN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Dorothy M. McGeoch
Teachers College, Columbia University

in collaboration with

Charles R. Bruning
and
Calvin C. Eland
Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory

SP002576

## CONTENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| Foreword | V |
| Preface | VI |
| Part I - Campus Laboratory Schools - Development and Status | 1 |
| Part II - The Wisconsin Laboratory Schools | 10 |
| Part III - Implications and Supporting Data | 19 |
| Part IV - Recommendations for Action | 39 |
| Appendices | 49 |

## DEFINITION

The term, laboratory school, indicates generally any school, on or off-campus, that serves in some way to provide clinical environments for observation, participation, laboratory testing, student teaching or interning, and similar clinical experiences. When referring to an on-campus laboratory school the term, campus school, is used.

Report of the Wisconsin Conference 1967

## FOREWORD

The Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory has had as its focus teacher education with a specific emphasis on development of "teacher competence." It has been concerned with developing greater involvement of public school systems into pre-service teacher education via the joint appointment process.

The study of the Wisconsin laboratory school system afforded a good opportunity to look at feasible relationships on a statewide basis. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education for the State of Wisconsin invited the Regional Laboratory to participate in this study and the Laboratory was eager to do so.

The Regional Laboratory was indeed fortunate to be able to obtain the consultative services of Dr. Dorothy McGeoch for this study.

It is the hope of the Regional Laboratory that this study can contribute to the developing inter-relationships of schools and colleges and universities as they view their respective roles in the process of teacher education, both pre-service and in-service.

Charles R. Bruning
Program Coordinator
August 6, 1968

# PREFACE

The study of campus laboratory schools has been a major preoccupation of committees, commissions, legislators and administrators in Wisconsin and in many other places, during the last ten to fifteen years. The reason for such attention is not hard to find. Campus schools are expensive and it is generally not entirely clear whether they are worth what they cost.

The present study of the campus schools in the state-supported universities of Wisconsin was conducted by an Advisory Committee to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. It included extensive collection of data on many aspects of the work of the campus school and visits by consultants to the institutions involved. This report is based on both the compilations of the committees and the information gained from the visits.

A brief history of campus laboratory schools in the United States provides background for a summary of the present status of the campus schools associated with Wisconsin universities. Implications are then developed from the information at hand and recommendations are made for state and institutional action.

There is no answer to the question concerning the worth of the campus school in this report. There is recommended, however, a course of action which will enable each of the institutions involved to assess the value of its campus school to its program of teacher education and to make reasoned judgments concerning the school's function and future. If such assessment does, in fact, occur the report will have served its purpose.

Many people in the universities and the campus schools contributed significantly to the completion of questionnaires, to the assembling of information and to helpful discussions with the consultants. Their time and effort was, of course, much appreciated and very valuable. The members of the Advisory Committee and William White, Associate Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, organized and carried through all aspects of the study. Without their efforts there could have been no report. Most valuable, too, has been the help of my two collaborators, Charles Bruning and Calvin Eland, who made visits, discussed impressions and worked on successive drafts of the written report. They gave me useful criticism and much appreciated support.

A final expression of gratitude must go to Mrs. Vera Tyler without whose faithful assistance and long hours of typing my task would have been immeasurably more difficult.

DMM

. . . . .We want an even more intimate union here, so that the University shall put all its resources at the disposition of the elementary school, contributing to the evolution of valuable subject matter and right method, while the school in turn will be a laboratory in which the student of education sees theories and ideas demonstrated, tested, criticized, enforced, and the evolution of new truths. We want the school in its relation to the university to be a working model of a unified education.

John Dewey, The School and Society
(p. 82-83)

# I. CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOLS — DEVELOPMENT AND STATUS

For well over one hundred years after the opening of the first campus schools in this country there was no question about the role or function of such schools. They were established and maintained as places where the prevailing ideas about school methods and management could be demonstrated and practiced for the enlightenment of the prospective teacher in the normal school, the teachers college or, more rarely, the university.

An emphasis on experimentation and innovation began to be prominent in some campus schools about the turn of the century and during the next thirty years famous schools for children were developed at the University of Chicago, Ohio State University, George Peabody College for Teachers, Teachers College and others.

The influence of such schools on educational practices throughout the nation was disappointing, however, and after the second world war, efforts began to be made to find new means for disseminating ideas and promoting improvements in teacher preparation. Cooperation between schools and colleges increased and the campus school entered a period of change and uncertainty. Now, however, discernible trends are beginning to emerge from the time of testing.

## What's In A Name?

Probably the most effective way of gaining a general impression of the functions of the schools attached to teacher-preparing institutions during their long history is to review the various names by which such schools were called during that time.[1]

---

[1] Lois C. Blair, Dwight K. Curtis, and A. C. Moon, The Purposes, Functions, and Uniqueness of the College Controlled Laboratory School, Bulletin 9, (Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Association for Student Teaching, 1958).

In the early 1800's, Samual Hall, Harry Bernard and their contemporaries advocated the development of practice schools in conjunction with the new seminaries for teachers. In such schools, prospective teachers had an opportunity to practice specific methods of presenting subject matter and organizing instruction. Through such practice, skill in performance of clearly defined instructional tasks was developed and assessed.

Richard Edwards, president of Illinois Normal University, stated the purpose of the practice school thus,

> . . . the school for practice is unquestionably essential to the complete idea of a Normal School. When the young practitioner is dealing with children, he encounters the reality of his work. The actual difficulties of this employment are before him. There is no make-believe. He is never in doubt as to where his methods are such as to instruct and interest children, for the children are there, and he can see for himself, and all others can do the same, whether they are instructed and interested, or not. Every question he asks, every suggestion he makes is tested on the spot by the proper and natural test.[2]

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century the emphasis in the normal schools began to shift toward a concern for theory and method accompanied by an opportunity to observe model lessons which illustrated the theory taught. The model school provided such an opportunity. Teachers from the district schools whose practices were judged to be worthy of emulation were employed to give model performances for classes of normal school students--and performances they definitely were.

The term "training school" was often associated with the Pestalozzian influence as exemplified by Edward A. Sheldon at Oswego. The training incorporated both the concept of model and that of practice since the special methods classes were cen-

---

[2] Merle L. Borrowman, Editor, Teacher Education in America, (New York: Teacher College Press, 1965), pp. 81-82.

tered on the observation of lessons taught by the training school teachers or the methods teachers and immediately reproduced by the students either with children in the school or with members of the methods classes role-playing as pupils.

> . . . Many of the college-controlled elementary and secondary schools adopted the name of training school, and, increasingly, serious attempts were made in normal schools and colleges of education to develop a series of courses in which special rules or systems of teaching each subject were prescribed.[3]

As a reaction to the Pestalozzian influence, the Herbartian philosophy, advocated by the McMurrays and Charles De Garmo, soon began to influence the activities of the laboratory schools. Here again was an emphasis upon showing-how with a special concern for clearly-stated educational goals and detailed planning. The "demonstration school" was seen as the focal point of the teacher education institution where prospective teachers watched the teaching of lessons from plans they had previously studied and then tried to perform as efficiently in terms of the Five Formal Steps when they stood before their own classes. The influence of the Herbartians, as exemplified in the Morrison Plan, continued well into the twentieth century, particularly at the secondary level.

In the meantime, however, the progressive movement was again redefining the role of the teacher and, to help teachers learn to act in ways which were quite without precedent, "experimental schools" were established. Such schools were not intended as bases for student teaching experience but were deliberately designed to try out new ideas which might then be adopted by more typical schools. It was the failure of the Lincoln School, at Teachers College–Columbia University, to effectively influence practice which led to its closing in 1948 and marked the beginning of a period of change and reassessment for the campus school.

---

[3] Blair, Curtis, and Moon, op. cit., p. 5.

## The Search For Identity[4]

Another event which occurred in 1948 had an even more immediate effect on the role of the campus school. The subcommittee on School and Community Laboratory Experiences of the American Association of Teachers Colleges published a report which emphasized pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences and student teaching in a variety of "representative" situations.[5] The influential report and the concern for more effective ways of influencing practice in the schools gave impetus to the development of a variety of cooperative arrangements between colleges and school systems. Student teachers were placed for all or part of their experience in off-campus schools and college staff members, including campus school teachers, began to work with their neighboring schools.

Two major studies, completed about twelve years apart, show both the direction of change and the relative stability of the major functions of the campus schools. Rucher's survey of 185 campus schools in 1952 indicated that more than 85 percent of the schools had responsibility for observation, demonstration and participation functions as well as student teaching.[6] One hundred five of the schools reported that laboratory experiences, other than student teaching, were increasing; 68 schools reported an increase in student teaching, 47 were reducing student teaching, and 37 schools mentioned an increase in research activities.

In 1964, 186 institutions provided information regarding the relative importance of the seven possible laboratory school functions listed in a survey questionnaire prepared by Evan

---

[4] Louis Rzeka, "The Campus School: Its Search for Identity," Journal of Teacher Education, 13: 24-29, March 1962.

[5] John G. Flowers, Chairman, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948).

[6] Winfred R. Rucher, A Critical Analysis of Current Trends in Student Teaching, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1952).

Kelley of Indiana University. His results showed that the seven functions were rated as important in the following order: observation, demonstration, student teaching, participation, experimentation, research and in-service training.[7]

Kelley's study documented the decreasing importance of student teaching in the campus school but it also showed clearly another trend:

> Campus schools had been discontinued entirely in 22 instances in the past ten years. (Eighteen of these instances occurred in the past five years.) Grade levels had been dropped by 38 schools during the same period; where grade levels had been dropped and the school continued in operation, the upper, or 9-12 grade levels, had the greatest mortality rate.[8]

Kelley's figures have been challenged and the differing definitions of campus schools make it difficult to document exactly the changes which have been taking place. It is known, however, that at least fifteen of the campus schools listed in Kelley's study have or are about to be discontinued as of June, 1968.

There is no doubt that the campus schools are feeling the threat to their continued existence. One evidence of this is the increased emphasis on research and experimentation. The demonstrated need for better teacher education programs, the search for academic respectability in institutions which are rapidly becoming multi-purpose state universities, and newly developed graduate programs are all contributing causes of this emphasis. For many schools, however, the desire to claim some attention to research is one more attempt to insure survival.

---

[7] Evan Hugh Kelley, College-Controlled Laboratory Schools in the United States – 1964, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1964).

[8] Evan Hugh Kelley, "The Status of the Campus Laboratory School in the United States," Laboratory School Administrators Association Newsletter Vol. 10, No. 1:11, Fall 1967.

For, like the condemned man who tries all avenues of appeal in the hope that something will work, the campus school of the 1960's is seeking desperately to hold on to the familiar functions which it knows well while at the same time adding whatever seems necessary and desirable to gain the support and security required to continue its existence.

But there are dangers, too, in attempting more than the available resources of the individual schools can support. The search for a unique function and identity is at present the major task of the campus school. A recent article in the Journal of Teacher Education states it well:

> Educators who have been concerned with the role and purpose of the laboratory school have begun to take a more searching look at its multiple activities in an attempt to determine which functions should be given the greatest emphasis if it is to make its most significant contribution to a modern preservice program for teachers. To date, there appears to be no consensus among educators as to the relative importance of the various laboratory school functions.[9]

## THE WAY AHEAD

The search for identity is far from over and it would require a powerful crystal ball, indeed, to predict the future of the campus school at the present time.

The influence of such innovations as microteaching and simulation systems supported by rapidly developing technology is as yet unclear. The full potential of real partnerships between teacher preparing institutions, public school systems, and state departments of public instruction is only beginning to be explored. Paid internships for teachers at several levels of preparation may move most or all of the professional component of the education of teachers into off-campus centers, or team teaching

---

[9] James B. Jackson, "An Evaluation of the Relative Importance of the Various Functions Performed by a Campus Laboratory School," Journal of Teacher Education 18:293, Fall, 1967.

and use of auxiliary personnel may change radically the role, and the needed preparation, of the elementary and secondary school teacher. And finally, federally supported research and development centers, regional laboratories and projects financed under the new Education Professions Development Act may have an as yet unimagined influence on research and experimentation in education. Their relation to the campus schools, or even to the teacher preparing institutions themselves, remains to be defined.

There are many who are frankly pessimistic about the future of the campus school. Lathrop and Beal in a study done in 1965 found a number of factors which impose limitations on such schools. Chief among these are lack of money and disinterest on the part of the professional education faculty of the institution of which the school is a part. The campus school is also limited in the extent to which it can provide practicum and observation facilities in most institutions with constantly increasing enrollments. The almost complete separation of the campus school staff from the university faculty group is cited as another limitation. And finally, the lack of a strong research orientation and of flexibility which might enable the schools to adjust to changing conditions are listed.[10] Lathrop and Beal then conclude:

> In the opinion of the writers most college-related schools cannot continue to exist as autonomous entities whose primary function is the education of a population of elementary or secondary school children. If the campus school is to survive it must re-examine its objectives and functions, relating them to the broader purposes of the academic setting in which it exists. For many laboratory schools such a realignment of functions will mean a de-emphasis of responsibility for the education of a continuous population of elementary or secondary school pupils, de-emphasis on "live" observation of teacher candidates, and substantially-greater commitment to experimentation, innovation, demonstration and research. In most schools such a realignment of purposes will be agonizing, requiring re-establishment of long dormant relationships with academic faculty and substantial reorientation of laboratory school personnel. In the judgment of the writers the two most important requisites for the maintenance of a vital campus-related school are a demonstrated interest on the part of the faculty members of the college of education that such a facility be available for observation

> innovation, and research, and second, that organizational and financial provisions be made which encourage and insure the dynamic and innovative character of the campus-related school, preventing it from stagnating outside the mainstream of educational progress which will characterize the last third of the twentieth century.[11]

In a related study published in the same volume, White concludes:

> Most of these schools have no strong connection with their parent institution or with the schools of the surrounding area. They bear a strong resemblance to the isolated examples of primitive societies living in the midst of a rapidly changing world. Their future is precarious if they do not make changes to meet the changing needs of the times.[12]

But, apparently convinced that there is need for "a college-related research, development and dissemination center . . . with a chance of once again capturing a leadership role among the schools of America," Bixby and Medley list the minimum conditions that must be met:

1. Goals must be restudied and restated so that they fit today's challenges both to elementary and secondary education and to teacher education.

2. Organizational patterns for combining higher education resources with those of forward-looking public schools must be cooperatively developed in order to enhance the efforts of both as they carry out their separate but closely related and independent missions.

---

[10] Robert L. Lathrop and Dalla K. Beal, "Current Status Of Selected College-Related Schools," Campus School: A Research and Dissemination Center, Paul W. Bixby and Harold E. Mitzel, editors, (State College, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1965).

[11] Lathrop and Beal, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

[12] Norman Dean White, "The Status and Potential of a Representative Sample of College-Controlled Laboratory Schools," Bixby and Mitzel, op. cit., p. 70.

3. Programs must be created and carefully evaluated that will again be models to be studied and hopefully emulated by public and private schools.

4. Staff must be recruited who have the ability and the desire to comprehend a "different" approach to a college-related research and development center.

5. Buildings and equipment that anticipate the future, including the maximum use of the newer communication and instructional media must be designed and built.

6. A research component must be structured in such a fashion that it cannot be pushed aside by the needs of the daily operation of the school.[13]

It is a long hard journey from the typical campus school of today to the research and dissemination center envisioned by Bixby and Mitzel and not all present schools will be able to make it. It seems certain, however, that those which do survive will do so because they have been able to define, in relation to the teacher preparing programs of which they are a part, the role which they are uniquely fitted to serve.

> The answer to the future of the laboratory school will probably be a practical one; removal of those whose role is that of a privileged educational enterprise lacking sufficient purpose to justify staff, plant, and budget; and continuence of those that provide unique and significant contributions, particularly in the needed area of substantial research in the processes of the classroom.[14]

---

[13] Bixby and Mitzel, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

[14] John F. Ohles, "Is the Laboratory School Worth Saving?", Journal of Teacher Education, 18:306, Fall, 1967.

## II. THE CAMPUS SCHOOLS IN STATE-SUPPORTED WISCONSIN UNIVERSITIES

The campus schools in Wisconsin developed as an integral part of the early normal schools. In many instances they occupied a part of the main, and only, building and were considered essential to teacher education programs which depended heavily on prescriptive admonitions and demonstration of "model" teaching behavior. They passed through the usual stages of growth and remained to become a part of the state university system which was inaugurated in 1964.

At the present time campus laboratory schools are maintained in connection with the State Universities at Eau Claire, La Crosse, Oshkosh, Platteville, River Falls, Stevens Point, Superior and Whitewater. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has a campus school; the University of Wisconsin in Madison closed its high school in 1964.

The 1968 report, Utilization of Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin, presents the following statistical description:

> Currently (September, 1967), 2197 students ranging from Head-start age through the ninth grade are enrolled in Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin. They are taught by 140 full-time equivalent faculty persons, the majority of whom hold the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor and have achieved tenure. The study reveals that Campus Laboratory Schools faculty members have had considerable experience in higher education as well as in public school education. The faculties are supported by 23 classified staff members. Total salary of the faculties is in excess of $1,200,000.00 for the academic year while classified staff members add another $126,000.00 to this budget item. The Campus Laboratory Schools instructional supply and equipment budgets amounts to about $90,000.00 with an additional $40,000.00 being collected through fees paid by the pupils. Six of the nine structures housing the Campus Laboratory Schools have been built in the past 15 years; total square feet used for the Campus Laboratory School functions amounts to 244,000.[15]

---

[15] CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools, Sub-Committee on Campus School Programs and Utilization, Robert Polk, Chairman, Utilization of Public Campus Laboratory Schools in Wisconsin, February, 1968, p. 1 (Mimeographed).

The Wisconsin campus schools are small schools, ranging in size from 284 to 186 pupils. All but one now have junior high school classes; two will terminate their junior high schools in June 1968. All have kindergarten groups and six have nursery school classes. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has special education classes; at least one other school is planning to set up such a class.

## Inventory of Staff Activities

The report on the utilization of the campus schools[16] and the information gathered from the Inventory of Activities of Laboratory School Teachers[17] describe the activities regularly carried on by the staff members of the nine schools.

The staff totals a full-time equivalent of 140 persons. The total number of individuals is much greater, however, since only about half are assigned full-time to the campus schools. In two institutions, teachers carry responsibility for an elementary school classroom with student teachers and observers while at the same time teaching one or more college classes each year. Teachers of academic subjects in junior high school and, in general, teachers in special areas, divide their time between campus school and college teaching responsibilities.

Student teachers are present in the classrooms of all but one campus school. The typical load is one full-time and one part-time student teacher at any one time with a total of eight or more during the year.

Junior students in elementary education are assigned in groups of five to ten for one hour a week or fifteen hours a semester in many schools. Observers and participants from methods classes are also present with considerable frequency. Plans for

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Appendix A.

demonstration classes or student participation in special areas are generally made by the college methods teachers and the campus school teacher, often on an informal basis. In some schools cooperative relations are facilitated by the fact that many of the methods teachers are former members of the campus school staff and are very much at home in the school.

The information concerning individual student observations and other classroom visitors is difficult to summarize. The eight schools report a total of nearly 25,000 individual observations and over 2,000 professional observations by in-service teachers during the 1966–1967 school year. (See form –– Appendix H.)

Out-of-classroom activities of campus school faculty are also numerous. All of the schools are engaged in curriculum development and experimentation. Some have institutional or funded research projects. On the average, teachers attend meetings or hold conferences four or five days a week after school or at night and participate in two or three special projects. Some projects such as the laboratory schools' mathematics study, the making of video tapes and serving on university curriculum committees demand substantial investments of time and energy. In all but one campus school the faculty members also advise college students; in two institutions as many as forty each.

Involvement in public school in-service programs, speaking at PTA's, serving on committees for professional organizations, and other service functions are fairly frequent but vary greatly from school to school and from individual to individual. Some professional writing is reported, and over half of the staff members indicate that they are continuing their own education during the summer. Quite understandably, only a very small minority are able to take courses during the academic year.

## Differences Among Campus Schools

While similar in many ways, the nine campus schools are also quite different. Two kinds of evidence, secured during the

last five years, underscore the difference. All of the WSU campus schools participated in the Kelley study in 1963.[18] At that time, priorities in terms of major functions were listed by some individual (presumably the director of the school) as he perceived them. Demonstration teaching was given the highest priority. It was ranked first or second by all but one school. Provision for observation by students was ranked first by four schools and was a close second in the combined ranking. Student teaching and experimentation ranked third and fourth on the list with almost equal rankings. Research ranked fifth, which indicated a slight deviation from the national norm which put research fourth and experimentation sixth. It is likely, however, that the difference was in definition of terms rather than in clear differentiation of role.

Three schools did not rank participation at all; indicating, it would seem, that it was not considered a significant function. One school, however, indicated participation opportunities as of primary importance. Various service functions, including in-service training, were rated as least important by both Wisconsin campus schools and by the national sample. Two Wisconsin schools omitted this function in their ranking.

The present study of the schools has yielded a combination of objective data from the utilization report and subjective impressions from visits to campuses and the Inventory of Activities of Laboratory School Teachers.[19] Although it is true that there is an effort to fill many roles, there is also evidence of preferences or priorities on the part of the different campus schools.

Two schools are very deeply involved in the undergraduate teacher education program with major concern for observation, demonstration, participation, and student teaching. In both instances a high priority is also given to service functions in relation to the area schools. Another campus school concentrates very heavily on the pre-student-teaching experiences of undergraduate

---

[18] Evan Hugh Kelley, op. cit.

[19] Appendix A

students with relatively lower priority given to all other functions. A combination of major efforts in student teaching and in experimentation characterizes the program of one school, while, in another, emphasis on experimentation and innovation is combined with concern for demonstration and dissemination to the schools of the surrounding area. In an institution which sends all of its student teachers off-campus there is a major concern for service to the area schools. Two other schools are increasingly active in the area experimentation and research while maintaining substantial efforts in each of the other fields.

There are also interesting differences in the way the schools seem to be perceived by the education faculty of the universities. In some institutions, the provision for pre-student-teaching laboratory experiences is perceived as a major contribution. A sizable number of the methods teachers may be former or present members of the campus school staff and there is constant, close relationship between the course work and the activities of the campus school. For these groups the accessibility and control possible in a campus school are of major importance.

In other institutions the campus school is still used for pre-student-teaching experiences but the college faculty members are less closely identified with and knowledgeable about the school program. The campus school is very useful as a place to send students but demonstration classes are rarely requested and campus school teachers serve as resource persons in college classes infrequently.

The report of the Sub-committee on Programs and Utilization[20] presented the reactions of professional education faculties concerning the degree to which the campus schools are helpful in developing ten commonly accepted teacher traits. (See questionnaire, Appendix I.) While it is true that a substantial majority of respondents indicated that, in their opinion, a campus school helps prospective teachers develop the designated teacher behav-

---

20 CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools, Sub-committee on Campus School Programs and Utilization, op. cit., p. 27-40.

iors, there were again some readily perceived differences among faculty groups on the effectiveness of the campus school in these areas. An interesting, but not easily explained, observation is that the schools which seem to be focusing least directly on the undergraduate laboratory experiences were in general rated as most helpful by the professional education faculty which responded to the questionnaire.

## Study of Campus School Functions

Wisconsin has continued to support campus schools in the State Universities but it has not been an unquestioning support. In fact, controversy concerning the function and value of the campus schools has been going on fairly continuously since 1959. At that time, Governor Nelson posed several questions concerning campus school operations and the consensus of the Coordinating Committee, the University of Wisconsin and the State Colleges was that on-campus college-controlled schools were essential to the programs of the institutions involved. Four basic purposes of the campus school were identified as:

1. Demonstration of superior pedagogical methods.
2. Observation and participation by student trainees.
3. Professional and lay leadership in the field.
4. Basic research and experimentation.[21]

Legislative action to close the campus school at Oshkosh in order to make available needed space was considered in 1962 and 1963. Detailed reports in support of the retention of the school and in elucidation of the financial and program impact of its closing were presented. No action was taken.

The State Colleges became State Universities and, in January 1967, a provisional long-range plan for higher education

---

[21] Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Joint Paper No. 2, August, 1959.

in Wisconsin, developed by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, again reopened the question of the campus schools. The report stated:

> In light of changing conditions and the heavy investment of limited resources and space on already crowded campuses, the CCHE staff questions the justification for the continuance of laboratory schools. An immediate re-evaluation by the systems involved and the CCHE of the total contribution of the campus school to higher education in Wisconsin is recommended.[22]

The recommendation for immediate re-evaluation resulted in a Wisconsin conference on the roles and functions of the laboratory schools in the State University System on June 28 to 30, 1967. The deans of the colleges of education and campus school directors of all the State Universities were there and so were representatives of the State Department of Public Instruction, the Board of Regents, the Council of Presidents and the Coordinating Council on Higher Education. The conference was sponsored by the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory (UMREL) in cooperation with the Johnson Foundation and representatives from the Laboratory as well as other invited consultants worked with the group. The results of the conference deliberations and a basic status study were brought together in a report which was presented to the Council of Presidents of the State University System on November 1, 1967.[23]

In the meantime, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education had appointed an Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools to consider further action. Membership in the advisory committee included representatives of the State Universities, the University of Wisconsin, the State Department of Public Instruction, the State Superintendents of Schools, and the State Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Three sub-committees (on Programs and Utilization,

---

[22]Staff of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, A Provisional Long-Range Plan for Higher Education, Wisconsin, January, 1967.

[23]Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, Roles and Functions of Laboratory Schools, (Report of the Wisconsin Conference), November 1, 1967. (Mimeographed)

on Relations with Public Schools and on State and National Trends) were appointed to gather information and make reports. These reports have provided extensive data on many phases of the campus school operations.

In December, 1967, the Advisory Committee approved the employment of a consultant from outside the state to work with staff members from UMREL in reviewing the accumulated data and in making recommendations for action. The consultants visited each unit of the state university system and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee during the first three months of 1968. They also spent some time with officials of the State Department of Public Instruction, the Board of Regents and the University of Wisconsin. In all of these contacts they attempted to gain a first-hand understanding of the campus schools and their relation to the state-supported programs of teacher education of which they are a part.

The visitation schedule provided for a full-day on each campus by one or more consultants. The activities were prestructured and, as far as possible, the same program was followed at each university. The morning was spent in interviews with the dean of the school of education and the campus school principal and in visiting the school itself.[24] At lunch the consultant met with campus school staff members and the discussion centered on the contribution that the school was perceived to be making to the institutional program of teacher education.[25] The members of the campus school staff were asked to record their activities for a five-day period on a form entitled Inventory of Activities of Laboratory School Teachers.[26] The information thus gathered was used in an attempt to gain a rough

---

[24]Appendix B -- Interview Guides for Deans and Principals.

[25]Appendix C -- Interview Guide for Campus School Staff.

[26]Appendix A

estimate of the actual load of the campus school teachers and amount of time devoted to various activities.

Another aspect of the consultant's visit to the universities was a meeting with the members of the faculty of the school or college of education. Here again the structured group interview was used to determine how the faculty perceived the campus school and their convictions concerning the importance of the functions which it served.[27]

The late afternoon of the day of visitation was devoted to meetings with groups of public school administrators selected by the dean or campus school principal. Six meetings were held at different universities. In each case the functions of the campus school were explained by a college representative and some alternate models involving school-college cooperation were presented by the consultant. After a discussion period, the administrators were asked to indicate on an opinionnaire their judgments as to the willingness of their school systems to participate in specific aspects of programs of observation-demonstration, student participation and student teaching, and educational research and experimentation.[28]

The implications and recommendations which follow rely heavily for support and documentation on the information gathered during the visitations; and on the studies, reports and position papers previously developed by the Advisory Committee, the Wisconsin Conference, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. They should be considered in conjunction with such background materials.

---

[27] Appendix D – Interview Guide for Professional Education Faculty.

[28] Appendix E – Opinionnaire: Participation of Public Schools in Teacher Education Programs.

## III. IMPLICATIONS AND SUPPORTING DATA

The study of the campus schools of the state-supported universities of Wisconsin suggests several major implications which are supported by the data at hand. These implications lead to recommendations which may be helpful in formulating a position on the function of campus schools in Wisconsin and in guiding future action. Each of the implications are discussed in the following sections.

### Institutional Purpose

Even a cursory consideration of the value of a campus school leads immediately to a consideration of the institutional setting of which it is a part. Basically, a campus school must be considered in terms of what it does, and what it does is a reflection of what its parent institution allows or requires it to do.

One section of the report of the Wisconsin Conference refers to the campus school as "a creature of an agency which prepares teachers."[29] This broad definition leaves room for the development of many functions and relationships. The campus school may be related closely to the program for the preservice preparation of teachers. In Wisconsin this is interpreted as referring most directly to early childhood, elementary and junior high school teachers since none of the campus schools maintains a full secondary school. In other institutions, in-service training and preparation of teachers, supervisory and administrative personnel, and special services' personnel may rank high as institutional goals and the campus school may be expected to contribute to the demonstration of innovative practice and the dissemination of tested ideas throughout the service area. As a third possibility, the development of graduate programs and research institutions in the university may be reflected by increased emphasis on the campus school as a means for providing the pupil population and

---

[29] Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., p. 18.

other resources for the research activities of faculty and graduate students.

In practice, the close relationship between institutional purpose and campus school function has not always been evident. In some instances, the articulation of purposes has suffered from lack of communication or from differing viewpoints on the part of the faculty of the college of education and the campus school staff.

Some campus schools have developed their own priorities with little reference to or interference from the rest of the institution. Some colleges of education accept passively the status quo or seek alternate ways of supplying needs which they do not perceive as being met by the campus school. Potentially, the institution has the power to shape the campus school to its own ends. Actually, traditional loyalties, established practice, and tenured staff members may make any desired shaping exceedingly difficult.

In the state-supported universities in Wisconsin there are, as has been previously indicated, significant differences in the strength and character of the relationship which exists between the various campus schools and the teacher education programs to which they are intended to contribute. In some institutions, the campus schools are so completely accepted as a necessary aspect of the teacher preparation program that it is difficult for faculty members to conceive of possible alternatives. Generally, in such situations, many of the professional education faculty are assigned part-time to the campus schools or are former members of the campus school staff.

There is beginning to be evidence that the campus school is perceived by some faculty members as a place where research projects may be instituted or experimental materials tried out. In other instances, however, the experimentation which has been instituted in the campus school has little or no relation to the teacher education program of the university. The increase in the number of graduate students in some colleges of education has increased the demand for facilities for experimentation. This

demand may be expected to increase in the future.

There is certainly evidence of some close relationships between campus schools and programs of professional education. There is also some indication that for some university faculty the campus school may occupy a position like that of the valued heirloom. It is loved, carefully protected, and rarely used. Indeed, for such persons, statements of value seem to be based on long accepted biases rather than current positive experiences.

Lathrop and Beal summarize their reactions to a series of visits to fifteen contemporary campus laboratory schools as follows:

> Perhaps if one were to put his finger on the basic problem that faces the college-related school it would be that not many people in education are really interested in whether the laboratory school survives or perishes. In many institutions the laboratory school has been allowed to chart its own course, unchallenged, for so many years that it is often difficult to locate any common ground between the school and its collegiate affiliate. Understandably faculty in colleges of education tend to be indifferent to a campus school which rarely intersects their interests.
>
> If the campus school is to survive it must be organized to insure some direct participation by the faculty of the college of education. If this is not the case, the two institutions are likely to grow further and further apart leaving the campus school, as has so often been the case in the past, simply a good private institution for faculty children.[30]

The evidence, again, is clear. The campus school exists to serve institutional purposes and, where such purposes are not clearly implemented, the school loses much, if not all of its reason for being.

> Implication: The value of the campus school can be assessed only in terms of the extent to which it contributes to the purposes and programs of the institution of which it is a part.

---

[30] Lathrop and Beal, op. cit., pp. 93-94.

## Multiple Roles

The tendency of many campus schools to attempt to perform a variety of functions with insufficient resources or support has been discussed in a previous section of this report. In this respect, the campus schools of the Wisconsin State Universities are quite typical.

In ten years of waging a defensive battle for existence the campus schools have found it necessary and expedient to take on new responsibilities while still continuing their former activities. They have tried to be "all things to all men." They have developed long lists of roles and functions and made extensive reports of current research and innovative projects underway. In a continuing attempt to prove themselves irreplacable in many fields, they have found it impossible to develop the kind of excellence in clearly defined areas which cannot indeed be readily replaced.

The figures in the report on the utilization of the campus schools[31] and the information gathered from the Inventory of Activities of Laboratory School Teachers[32] amply document the variety of activities performed by the campus school staff members.

The teaching load in most cases is exceedingly heavy. A summary of the average load of a full-time teacher in one of the schools is fairly typical of all. The campus school teacher is responsible for a class of 20 to 25 elementary school pupils and teaches a methods class in reading or arithmetic for nine weeks each year. She works with a full-time or part-time student teacher each quarter and may have two at the same time. Five junior participants are assigned one hour each day to her classroom and she plans with them one or two periods each week.

---

[31] CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools, Sub-committee on Campus School Programs and Utilization, op. cit.

[32] Appendix A.

About 75 to 100 undergraduate students observe through the one-way vision screen each week. In addition to the constant unscheduled observations an average of three demonstration classes are planned for class groups each week. Sometimes the campus school teacher meets with the class instructor before the demonstration or attends a class session to answer questions afterwards. Visitors to the observation room, other than students, average 10 to 15 each week.

The after-school hours of the campus school teacher are far from free. In addition to conferences with students, she attends about five staff meetings or committee meetings each week. She is engaged in several special projects which may include experimentation or curriculum development. Occasionally she speaks at an in-service workshop or conducts a Saturday demonstration for a graduate class.

She values her contacts with the school of education and willingly accepts her share of advisees from the elementary education majors. Her own graduate work is confined to those summers when she can afford to give up a salary for summer school teaching. Although she generally looks forward to joining the professional education staff her progress toward the necessary advanced degree is likely to be slow.

As evidence of substantial efforts to function in each of the seven commonly listed roles of the campus school – observation, participation, demonstration, student teaching, experimentation, research and service to the schools and the profession – these data are truly impressive. But they also prove conclusively that the campus school staff members are busy about many things; too busy, in fact, to become truly expert in many of their varied roles. When planning and studying must be done after a ten or twelve hour day of constant activity, there is little chance for breadth of scholarship or newly conceived classroom strategies. Or when student teachers and participating students number as many as six at one time, use of analytical conferring techniques or research tools for providing feedback becomes impractical, even if the teacher has had the opportunity to learn the techniques in the first place. Curriculum development can also

become no more than a series of bandaids applied to mortal wounds when there is continued initiation of experiments and innovations without fundamental consideration of philosophy or purpose to be served.

The campus school directors, after the Wisconsin Conference, reported to the council of presidents that the conference "brought into sharp definition the best possible roles, functions, and ways of utilizing the Laboratory School – where as before each school had a multiplicity of purpose without being sure of a few major goals."[33] (Emphasis added).

The task is clearly stated but it is far from finished. It must be done if the efforts of hard-working campus school faculties are to result in achievements whose significance is in any way compatible with the effort expended.

> Implication: The Wisconsin campus schools are at the present time attempting or being expected to serve a variety of roles for which they do not have adequate staff, financial resources, or institutional support.

## Development of Differences

The campus schools in the state-supported universities have been described as being much alike. Superficially, this is true. The data collected in the present study, however, indicate that there are important differences in the ways the campus schools in various institutions perceive their major roles and in the ways they are perceived by the colleges and schools of education of which they are a part.[34] Such differences may well be the beginning of the clarification and limitation of roles which is so necessary. This process may in turn lead to a differentiation and

---

[33] Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., p. 1

[34] See pp. 13-17.

diversity of roles which will provide within the state university system outstanding exemplifications of several vital functions in a teacher education program.

It is conceivable, for instance, that one institution might concentrate on developing a wide variety of video-tapes of classroom teaching behavior which could be used not only in Wisconsin but elsewhere. Such a major effort is urgently needed. It will never be possible to know what can be done in college classes with readily available taped episodes to illustrate many kinds of teaching strategies until a serious effort is made to prepare and distribute such materials.

Another Wisconsin campus school might well become a center for the demonstration of a school program carefully developed within a defined conceptual framework which would illustrate the use of innovative practices and instructional media carefully programmed to make an optimum contribution to the operational goals of the school. This, too, is a desperately needed project.

A third campus school might be devoted primarily to in-service education with experienced teachers working in the school with the regular staff for defined periods in some variation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. Staff members would be selected for their ability to work in a team relationship within the school and to serve effectively as leaders of in-service activities in the field. A staff of sufficient size so that individual members could rotate regularly between predominently on-campus and off-campus assignments would be necessary and close coordination of effort with the Cooperative Educational Service Agency and other state and local organizational units would be required.

In some of the state universities, a research oriented facility with sufficient size, flexibility and support to carry out controlled experimentation in a variety of fields might be developed. There would be no permanent staff but teachers and research specialists would be recruited for their competence in relation to the particular research project to be undertaken and employed for a

specific length of time. The school population would also be selected to provide suitable subjects for the individual project and would remain in the experimental setting only for the duration of the study. Through shared control and responsibility of university and a local school system open channels of communication could be maintained and opportunities for dissemination of research findings developed.

There are many more possibilities. It is tempting to speculate on what could happen under such conditions. The focus of this discussion, however, is that there are differences in the way the Wisconsin campus schools now function in their institutions and in the contributions they are able to make. These differences need to be recognized, fostered, coordinated and supported as each university attempts to define and limit the role of its campus school in terms of its unique contribution to the total program of the institution.

> Implication: The function of the campus school must be clearly defined in relation to the institutional purposes and available resources if the individual school is to make its unique contribution to the teacher education program of which it is a part.

## Considerations of Economy

The campus schools are, as has been said, inadequately supported to do all of the things which they are presently trying to do but the financial expenditure is, nevertheless, not inconsiderable.

Education of any kind is costly in these times and the escalating budgets of institutions of higher learning are a focus of concern for any legislative body. In institutions for the preparation of teachers increasing numbers must be accommodated and more extensive programs must be provided to meet the requirements of the times. The expenditures for campus schools constitute a highly visible and often controversial item in the budgets of the colleges and schools of education. There is a not unnatural tendency, therefore, to consider whether there are cheaper ways to provide the needed services.

In general, it seems that there are not. Duplication by other agencies of the activities now performed by the campus schools would not be inexpensive. Closed circuit television or video taping of public school classes which might provide an alternative to observation in the campus school would require considerable expenditure for skilled technical personnel and for equipment and supplies. Transportation of large numbers of students to community schools for observation and participation experiences is expensive in terms of time and effort for both students and staff as well as requiring substantial subsidies to the school system involved. Other functions, such as research and experimentation, would be likely to require as much or more support, if they were performed in selected cooperating school systems, than they now do as coordinate functions of the campus school.

But the major concern cannot be merely the expense of duplicating present services. It must be rather a determination of the most productive use of all available resources to produce a teacher education program of high quality. In one situation this may mean a substantial increase in the operating budget of the campus school to enable it to perform effectively a variety of functions which cannot be done as well in any other way. In another institution, the money now budgeted for the campus laboratory school may, in the future, be more effectively used in supporting cooperative arrangements with public schools. In still another situation, the campus school may be delegated a limited number of functions which it is uniquely suited to perform while additional funds are used to improve and extend the teacher education program through a variety of cooperative arrangements.

This is a time of reassessment and restructuring in the field of teacher education. There is very little on which authorities agree but the importance of a complete program of professional clinical experiences has almost universal support. Community service experience, observation and analysis of teaching behavior, micro-teaching, student teaching and internships, are all important aspects of a modern program of preservice teacher education. Graduate programs too are increasingly including

clinical experience and participation in research activities as requirements for professional personnel aspiring to leadership positions. Research and demonstration centers are becoming an important part of the program of in-service education in many institutions. Facilities for a variety of clinical experiences are an increasingly important —— and expensive —— part of any teacher education program. The determination of how available funds may be most profitably used to provide such facilities can best be made by the individual institution. It may be that more effective means of providing needed facilities can be developed in some instances. It is safe to say, however, that less expensive ones cannot.

> Implication: It is unrealistic to consider closing the campus schools for reasons of economy; facilities for clinical experiences in a modern program of teacher preparation whether or not they include campus schools, require increased budgets and substantially greater support than is now generally available.

## School—University Cooperation

In July 1967, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education issued a position paper on campus laboratory schools in Wisconsin state institutions. The following statements concerning school-university cooperation were made:

> The projected needs and enrollments in teacher education programs require that all Wisconsin public universities engaged in the preparation of teachers expand their cooperative agreements whereby teacher trainees are placed in the public schools. The successful expansion of this program would require close cooperation both among Wisconsin's higher educational institutions and between the separate universities and cooperating public schools. Most of the state's public schools are developing strong staffs and, as they are critically aware of the expanding qualitative as well as quantitative demands for strong teachers, they are willing to make their classrooms available to the universities on a cooperative basis for practice teaching, research, and experimentation.[35]

---

[35] Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Joint Paper No. 44, July, 1967, p. 6.

It may be that some aspects of that statement are open to challenge but the participants in the Wisconsin Conference stated as a major goal the development of "collaborative relationships between laboratory schools, educational service organizations, the internal departments of the University, and the State Department of Public Instruction to improve educational practices in the University service areas."[36]

If the many functions now assumed by the campus schools are accepted as essential, and in some form they must be, the campus schools will either have to be radically enlarged or additional ways must be found to accomplish some of the desired ends. The folly of attempting to perform all functions in the campus schools as they now exist has been clearly demonstrated. Even with sharply increased support, no one school can begin to meet the needs of the teacher education program in a growing university. A more effective though not less expensive means of resolving the impasse is through developing cooperative relations with public schools.

The Sub-committee on Relationships with the Public Schools conducted two studies to gain information concerning the reactions of public school personnel to the feasibility of duplicating the functions now performed by the campus schools in the public schools of the state.

A questionnaire on the Role of the Public School District in Student Teaching and Internships[37] was sent to eighty-one Wisconsin communities, and replies were received from sixty-four. The committee report states that "the communities represent a major proportion of those communities that might be used for student teaching purposes."[38] From the results of this survey

---

[36] Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., p. 19.

[37] Appendix F.

[38] CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools, Sub-committee on Relationships with the Public Schools, Allen T. Slagle, Chairman, Reactions of Wisconsin School District Administrators to the Role of Their Respective Public School Districts in Student Teaching and Internship Programs, February, 1968, p. 1.

the committee drew the following conclusions:

1. School district administrators generally favor cooperation with university teacher education programs but feel that they should limit the number of student teachers (to about fourteen percent of the total teaching staff) and allow teachers and administrators the freedom to accept or not accept student teachers.

2. There is a rather heavy use of available public school situations for student teaching purposes at present, with a significant amount of competition for the same facilities and teachers.

3. If the masters degree and three years teaching experience (one of which is in the school system) is considered as the desirable minimum preparation and experience for supervising teachers, and if we limit one student teacher per supervising teacher as recommended by accrediting associations, we are dangerously close to the saturation point in terms of student teachers accommodated at the elementary school level.

4. Student teaching programs in public schools are subject to curtailment or even possible elimination through actions of several different groups – boards of education, parent groups, teacher bargaining agencies. The greatest danger of curtailing or eliminating some student teaching programs comes from a combination of the following factors: a) the generally accepted prerogative of teachers and principals to accept or decline an invitation to supervise a student teacher; b) the generally accepted belief that both financial incentives and some kind of released time is essential to do an adequate job; c) neither financial incentives or some kind of released time are being provided to the satisfaction of many teachers; d) teacher bargaining agencies are having increasing influence in school policies including those related to student teaching.

5. The present availability of internship positions are limited. Certainly no great increase of interns could be handled at the present time if the present qualitative practices in this regard were to continue.[39]

The committee also prepared a questionnaire and interview instrument to be used by a representative of each state institution maintaining a campus school in determining the reaction of its local district administrator and the president of the teachers association in the district "to the kinds of concerns and questions deans of schools of education and directors of campus schools might raise if activities now conducted in the laboratory school were to be replaced through the schools in the community where the college is located."[40] (Appendix G)

The procedure in the structured interview was to explain the services now offered by the campus school and to ask the interviewee's opinion as to whether the public school could provide the service as needed, on a limited basis, or not at all. Other questions referred to degree of control which might be delegated to the university in relation to specific activities and the probable reactions of designated groups such as parents, school boards, teachers and principals. In general, the responses of both administrators and teacher association presidents indicated clearly that campus school activities such as observation, participation, controlled demonstrations, video-taping and research could not be easily duplicated in the public school systems of the communities in which the seven institutions were located. The teachers' representatives were consistently more negative toward taking on the campus school functions and less willing to delegate control

---

[39] CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory School, Sub-committee on Relationships with the Public Schools, op. cit., p. 4.

[40] CCHE Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory School, Subcommittee on Relations with the Public Schools, Allen T. Slagle, Chairman, Results of a Questionnaire and Interview Instrument Used with District Administrator and Presidents of Teachers Association in School Districts Where a Teacher Education Institution and a Campus Laboratory School Are in Operation, April, 1968, p. 1.

to the universities than the school administrators. In the opinion of the respondents, building principals, teachers and parents would also be quite definitely unwilling to accept an arrangement whereby the public school would assume the functions now performed by the campus laboratory school.

Administrators who attended the meetings held by the consultants at six university campuses were also asked to "indicate their judgments as to the willingness of their school systems to develop cooperative programs for observation-demonstration, student participation and educational research." The replies to this opinionnaire[41] were almost unanimous in expressing the belief that such cooperation was possible and that the necessary limits were negotiable. When asked to list difficulties or special problems in setting up cooperative programs, the administrators brought out many practical considerations such as limited facilities, distance from university, added burdens for staff and, frequently, the need for additional funds. The difficulty most often mentioned, however, was the need for cooperative decision-making and involvement of schools in planning. Comments such as these were typical:

It should not be college-dictated.
School staff should be in on the planning.
Lines of authority between staffs of university and public schools.
Determining what we can and can't do.
Planning the program.
Are Ph.D's who have limited classroom teaching experience going to be put in charge of the curriculum?
Need to get ourselves in a real position of trust.

Most of the groups also saw many advantages in the cooperative arrangement. The up-grading of staff, improvement in teaching methods, access to services from the university, and stimulation of innovation and research were frequently mentioned.

---

[41] Appendix E, Opinionnaire: Participation of Public Schools in Teacher Education Programs.

There were a few, however, to whom trust did not come so easily. One administrator wrote, "No advantage at present. It seems it would be most effective to up-grade the campus schools."

The reactions of these administrators reflect a not unwarranted perception of the implications of cooperation with the university. They see themselves as being asked to assume responsibility for part of the job of preparing teachers – a job that has traditionally been the prerogative of the college except for some off-campus student teaching placements. In fact, the student teaching model, which generally involves far more compliance than collaboration, is often the only basis they have for projecting the possibilities of joint endeavors. They are interested; they see advantages in cooperation, but they are also wary of domination and loss of control. Their reactions are generally comparable to those of university groups considering similar proposals for joint action.

No public school can be expected to duplicate the services of a college-controlled campus school. No teacher-preparing program can move some of its components to the public school without making important changes. It is quite likely, indeed, that some valued services will be lost. It is equally possible that there will be commensurate gains. Increasing numbers of teacher-preparing institutions are testing the advantages of carefully conceived partnership ventures of various types.

Wayne State University has developed ten cooperative teaching centers in Detroit and several suburban communities. Each of these centers is jointly operated by a steering committee of school and university personnel which is responsible for making decisions about the instruction in teaching which will be carried on in that center's undergraduate student teaching program.[42]

The University of Nebraska and the Lincoln School Dis-

---

[42] E. Brooks Smith, et. al, Toward Real Teaching: A Team Internship Proposal, (Detroit: Wayne State University, College of Education). 1967.

trict have recently dedicated a new laboratory school in the city about a mile from the teachers college. The School District constructed the building and the University financed the added physical features necessary for a modern laboratory school. The faculty are on the Board of Education payroll but receive additional payment from the University. In a statement defining a cooperative approach to program O. W. Kopp says in part,

> . . . . As experimental plans or approaches are designed, they will be tested with the approval of both administrations. Curriculum design must be considered within the framework of goodwill and progress — not as prerogatives. This principle is particularly true. . . the campus laboratory school is to design administrative and curricular programs which will be implemented and evaluated in cooperating public schools."[43]

The Elementary Internship Program at Michigan State University provides for two quarters at an off-campus center for each student during his junior year. The student studies elementary school teaching methods, which are integrated with his student teaching. The course work is taught by MSU faculty assigned to the center. An outstanding classroom teacher and an MSU resident staff member supervise the student teaching. After a final junior quarter and a summer session on the University campus completing work in general education, the student returns to the center as an intern. He is supervised by an intern consultant, the resident university faculty member and the school principal.[44]

The School-University Teacher Education Center (SUTEC), which opened in March 1966, is a five-year project of the New York City Board of Education and the Department of Education at Queens College of the City University of New York. Located in P.S. 76 in Long Island City, SUTEC is a demonstration and research program established to coordinate all available resources

---

[43] O. W. Kopp, The Clare McPhee Story, Publication 209, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Teachers College), 1965, p. 15.

[44] Michigan State University, College of Education, Elementary Intern Program, (Lansing: University of Michigan, Undated).

[45] School-University Teacher Education Center, Plans for the Urban Child, (New York: SUTEC, 1967).

of the school system, the college, and the community in order to develop the best possible program for an urban elementary school. An Inquiry Institute and a Research Team, staffed by highly-trained college personnel and housed at the school, are active in community research projects in providing new materials and in evaluating the total program.[45]

And finally, the new Marshall-University High School, a joint project of the University of Minnesota and the Minneapolis Public Schools, will open in September, 1968. The step-by-step development of the plans for this venture provides a model for the process involved in such cooperative undertakings.[46]

These examples and many others which could be cited are not intended as blueprints for the development of school-university cooperation in Wisconsin. They do illustrate, however, the results of the pooling of financial resources and diverse talents. They suggest that possibilities for building individually designed cooperative relationships in teacher education also exist in Wisconsin and that such relationships could result in more effective programs of teacher preparation.

> Implication: The development of cooperatively controlled and financed programs in partnership with public school systems is important as a means of using resources effectively in expanding programs of teacher education, research and experimentation.

## Irreplaceable Functions

Much effort has been expended in Wisconsin, and elsewhere, in an attempt to define the irreplaceable functions of the campus school. Perhaps those efforts might have been more profitably spent in developing the essential elements of a program for the collegiate education of school personnel. It is evident that, since the functions of the campus school cannot be considered

---

[46] Advisory Committee on the Proposed Marshall-University High School, Progress Report, December, 16, 1967.

apart from the institutional purposes which they support, there can be no definition of functions apart from the requirements of the teacher education program.

It would seem reasonable to assume that the campus school may be considered as one among several alternate possibilities for implementing specific aspects of an institutional program. In any particular situation at a given time, however, it may offer the best or perhaps the only means by which one or more essential functions may be implemented.

The important, and difficult, task before each institution is to assess its institutional purposes in the nine areas developed and defined at the Wisconsin Conference: innovation, dissemination, experimentation, demonstration, new designs for teacher education, change, new media development, service, and observation and experimentation.[47] Only when such an assessment has been made in cooperation with the Department of Public Instruction, the Cooperative Educational Services Agency (CESA), and the public schools of the region can the university begin to consider the means to be used to satisfy the defined needs.

The recent development of new media such as portable audio and video tape recorders, closed circuit television, and time-lapse photography hold great promise for facilitating focused and purposeful observation. Simulation and microteaching experiences may provide a basis for participation reinforced by analysis and feedback. Partnership arrangements with public schools may develop new ways of providing direct classroom experiences, experimentation and research in a regular classroom setting. Service to the area schools and communities may be based, not in the university or the campus school alone, but in cooperation with a regional study council, a CESA center, or some other newly developed agency.

All of these alternatives are possible in some situations;

---

[47] Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

some of them are probably desirable in any situation. Their potential contributions must be considered along with that of the campus school in the allocation of functions and responsibilities. The campus school, like every other agency or institution, should continue to exist when there are essential functions which it can serve better than any other agency which is or can be made available. If the time should come when no such essential function exists, the campus school will, in fact, have been replaced.

Implications: There are no irreplaceable functions of campus schools. There are, however, essential functions of institutional programs of teacher education which, at a given time and in a particular situation, may be best implemented by maintaining a campus school.

## Summary of Implications

The study of the campus schools in the state-supported universities of Wisconsin resulted in an accumulation of many facts and numerous opinions. The university faculty members, the campus school teachers, the administrators and the public school personnel who replied to questionnaires and participated in discussions and conferences, expressed a variety of viewpoints and provided a substantial volume of information. The consideration of the historical background of campus schools and a review of recent surveys and trends gave perspective and breadth to the consideration of the situation in a single state. Six implications emerged from the study and were summarized as follows:

The value of the campus school can be assessed only in terms of the extent to which it contributes to the purposes and programs of the institution of which it is a part.

The Wisconsin campus schools are at the present time attempting or being expected to serve a variety of roles for which they do not have adequate staff, financial resources, or institutional support.

The function of the campus school must be clearly defined in relation to the institutional purposes and available resources if the individual school is to make the unique contribution to the teacher education program of which it is a part.

It is unrealistic to consider closing the campus schools for reasons of economy; facilities for clinical experiences in a modern program

of teacher preparation, whether or not they include campus schools require increased budgets and substantially greater support than is now generally available.

The development of cooperatively controlled and financed programs in partnership with public school systems is important as a means of using resources effectively in expanding programs of teacher education, research, and experimentation.

There are no irreplaceable functions of campus schools. There are, however, essential functions of institutional programs of teacher education which, at a given time and in a particular situation, may be best implemented by maintaining a campus school.

## IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The implications listed above grew out of the activities of the study of campus schools in state-supported universities in Wisconsin. They suggest related actions which could appropriately be taken by the responsible agencies in responding to the existing situation. The recommendations which follow are intended to set forth a framework and a plan for such actions.

1. **It is recommended that the responsible agencies endorse as policy the principle that each campus school will henceforth be considered individually in relation to its contribution to the program and purposes of the institution of which it is a part. This means that the future of each school would depend on institutional decision rather than on some external fiat concerning the value of campus schools in general.**

It is impossible to say anything meaningful about a campus school in isolation from the institution of which it is a part. It is futile to try to determine profitable roles and functions except in the context of the institutional commitment and the resources available to implement that commitment.

Neither the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, nor the Board of Regents, nor the Wisconsin State Legislature, nor any group of consultants can make valid judgments as to whether the money spent for any particular campus school is being wasted or well used unless they are prepared at the same time to pass judgments on the purposes and programs of the sponsoring universities.

The perennial focus on the campus school, in Wisconsin and elsewhere, has resulted in a regrettable, but quite understandable, defensive posture on the part of almost anyone who has any stake in the continuation of such a school. The feeling of being constantly under attack has had a perceptible influence on the activities of the campus schools. They take on additional functions, trying to be "all things to all men," in hope of gaining support. They hesitate to investigate alternative ways of operating for fear they may be replaced by a television set or an off-campus center.

During the last ten years in Wisconsin a very considerable amount of time and money has been spent in mounting a continuing defense of campus schools whose existence has been constantly questioned. There is some evidence that the pressure may have, in some instances, contributed to the productiveness and morale of the campus school staff. There is no comparable evidence, however, that the defense of the campus school has had an equally favorable effect on the program of professional laboratory experiences and of community cooperation by the teacher education institutions involved.

Specifically, this recommendation suggests that the responsible agencies renounce as a matter of policy any consideration of the closing of the campus school on a wholesale basis or simply to save money. Such a position would be based on acceptance of the principle that a campus school cannot be considered apart from its relation to the program and purposes of the institution of which it is a part. It would also indicate acceptance of the evidence that duplication of campus school services by other agencies would not be cheaper even if it might, in some circumstances, be better.

Essentially, the acceptance of this recommendation would mean that the universities would be freed from the necessity to defend what they have and thus become free for evaluation of possible alternatives and needed decisions concerning means of providing for essential functions of institutional programs.

2. It is recommended that the efforts of institutions to develop alternative means of providing facilities for laboratory and clinical experiences for teacher education students and for research and experimentation be supported as fully as possible during a three to five year period. This support would take the form of funding specific proposals for establishment of off-campus centers, for cooperative ventures with other agencies, and for development of technological means of providing clinical experiences.

There is ample evidence, as indicated previously, that no one school of a reasonable size can perform effectively the many demonstration, participation and research functions required for a comprehensive program of teacher education from the begin-

ning of the professional sequence through its internship and continuing education aspects. Alternatives and supplementary facilities must be developed, and support for such innovative activities is necessary.

One promising avenue of exploration is in the use of media in various aspects of the preparation of teachers. The new standards of the National Council on Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) assert in an introductory statement,

> Clinical teaching involves the student in the diagnosis and treatment of the individual case, but under the guidance of an experienced teacher. Because it is now possible to stimulate many of these situations, or to display a selection of real cases electronically--and because the prospective teacher's efforts can be recorded, viewed and reviewed--it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the classroom. . . .[48]

Multimedia simulation systems are beginning to be developed. Video-taping of teaching performance is an integral part of micro-teaching techniques. Audio-recordings and time-lapse photography provide means for analyzing teaching behavior. Closed circuit television is used for observation and demonstration lessons. Other uses of media are also being proposed and tried out.

Much more study and experimentation is needed, however, in order to determine what the role of media can or should be in the future. At present, little is known about what the various media are supposed to accomplish, how they are related to the presumed results, and how to evaluate whatever it is that is supposed to happen. In Wisconsin, as in other places, there needs to be careful, fully-evaluated experimentation to determine the areas in which media can be profitably used. Support for such efforts, though certain to demand substantial expenditure, can prove exceedingly profitable in terms of improved programs of teacher education.

[48]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, (Washington, D.C.: The Association, December, 1967), p. 15

Equally important is the need for support of really intensive efforts to develop cooperative relationships with public schools and other state and regional agencies. There are precedents for such joint endeavors in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Improvement Program, initiated by the University of Wisconsin in 1958, started with the cooperation of nine school systems and a major focus of attention stated as follows:

1. the development of a five-year rather than a four-year program leading to teacher certification;

2. the improvement of clinical experience for prospective teachers, including the development of the teacher internship;

3. better utilization of certified workers in local school systems;

4. the addition of non-certified staff in local school systems, such as instructional secretaries, technicians, teacher aids, et al.;

5. increased utilization of learning equipment, with particular reference to programmed learning materials, self-teaching machines, television, et al.[49]

The internship program developed as part of the Wisconsin Improvement Program involved in 1967-68 about one hundred teaching teams located in thirty-five school systems in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Illinois in cooperation with eight state universities, a college, and the Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. Other aspects of the total program have also involved widespread cooperation among various agencies.

The Department of Public Instruction in Wisconsin has demonstrated leadership and willingness to support cooperative enterprises. The Laboratory Schools Mathematics Program has involved the campus schools in developing contextual framework materials and accompanying evaluative instruments for the state mathematics program. A description of the program by John C. Pearson, President of the Wisconsin State University Council of Laboratory School Directors says,

---

[49]Dean W. O'Brien. Continued Effort Toward Better Schools. (Madison: Wisconsin Improvement Program, School of Education, The University of Wisconsin, 1965).

> The plan ultimately calls for each Laboratory School to serve as a workshop for service area schools to provide demonstration and participation experiences in the use of the Guideline materials. These teachers will then feel adequate to the task of initiating the use of these materials in their respective school systems. Mr. Russell C. Mosely of the Department of Public Instruction has said that the expenses of such workshop could be supported by his department.[50]

An even more significant prospect for cooperation between the State Department of Public Instruction and the State Universities was outlined in the report, dated May 1, 1967, of the State Superintendent's Committee on Student Teaching and Internship. The report stated a basic philosophy concerning responsibility for student teaching and internship,

> In developing the guidelines for student teaching and internship, the Committee was impressed with the concept that this essential element in teacher preparation can be maximally realized only when it results from the assumption of joint responsibility by the three agencies: the Department of Public Instruction, institutions of higher education, and local school systems. The Committee recommends the provision of financial aids to school systems providing suitable student teaching and internship experiences. This recommendation recognizes the people's responsibility and desire to assure optimum educational opportunity.[51]

As an outgrowth of this report, the State Department of Public Instruction has prepared for legislative action a proposal calling for the support of a pilot project to initiate the implementation of its basic philosophy. In each of two centers, if the project is funded, one hundred student teachers will be placed in approved public schools which meet established criteria and the state will provide categorical aid to the local school districts to, in some measure, offset the financial contribution of the local district. Surely this proposal deserves the strong support of all those concerned about the quality of teacher education in Wisconsin.

---

[50]Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., Appendix M.

[51]State Superintendent's Committee on Student Teaching and Internship, Report to State Superintendent, May 1, 1967.

Another project still to win financial support is the Wisconsin component of the Four State Project sponsored by the National NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth under a grant from the United States Office of Education. This project, under the direction of Grace Lund, has involved in its planning colleges, universities, public schools, the State Department of Public Instruction and related agencies which serve children and youth. A series of interrelated proposals with a coordinated central structure which is statewide in scope have been developed. One of the major thrusts of the proposed programs for the preparation of educational personnel is the development of clinical teaching and training centers.

In summary, this recommendation encourages allocation of substantial funds for extending present efforts and developing additional means of performing functions which are presently partly or wholly assigned to the campus schools. Such innovative arrangements cannot be instituted without time for planning and development. All of the groups involved must assume new and often unfamiliar roles, and experience is needed in the new relationships. It therefore seems important to retain the campus schools during a transition period while developing alternatives and determining which campus schools should be continued for what specific purposes.

Since the number of such possible projects is unlimited and resources for implementing them are necessarily limited, a panel of experts might well be constituted to develop criteria and make recommendations to the responsible agencies concerning funding of specific proposals. Such a panel should include representatives from Wisconsin who are thoroughly informed concerning the teacher education programs in the state universities and also persons nationally known in the field who could bring a wide perspective and experience to the task. All decisions should be made within the framework of a concept of teacher education which includes undergraduate professional programs, internships, and pretenure experiences and continuing education for the professional teacher throughout his career. It would also be important that the panel be aware of and give consideration to the activities of a recommended study of teacher education in the state university system which will be discussed later in this report.

3. It is recommended that, concurrently with the development of new means of providing some of the functions now assumed by the campus schools, the faculty of the schools or colleges of education conduct a continuing study of the role of their campus schools with the object of reducing the number and variety of its functions as rapidly as possible. This study should result in the development of a specialized campus school structured to serve with distinction a particular purpose within a teacher education program for which no equally effective and economical alternatives are available or in the decision by the college of education to close its campus school in order to divert resources to more effective means of providing for essential functions.

The need for attempting less in order to accomplish more has already been discussed. One of the foundational statements included in this report of the Wisconsin Conference states:

> Identification and limitation of their specific roles and responsibilities are essential if laboratory schools are to provide positive, productive leadership in curriculum change, K through 16. Employing their unique strengths, as well as area school district needs, some laboratory schools should deliberately stress certain functions; other schools should focus on laboratory responsibilities and programs in terms of their particular strengths.[52]

Other sections of the same report also suggest limitation and specialization of function. Such a change is easier to talk about than to bring to pass, however, to an extent it depends on alternate ways being developed to do some of the things now being done by the campus school. It also depends on the institutional goals and resources and a clear definition of the place of the campus school in relation to both. There are, moreover, practical and human considerations relating to staff competence, physical facilities, nature of pupil population, and level of support.

The basic point is clear, however, if the campus school is to survive, it will be, in the long run, because it has indeed--in a

---

[52]Report to the Council of Presidents from the Deans of Education, op. cit., p. 13.

particular situation at a particular time--a job to do which cannot be as effectively or as efficiently done in any other way. Time and effort expended in such definition of function will be more productive than any formulation of long lists of unquestionably desirable goals which have little relation to the realities of an understaffed, under-supported, two hundred-fifty-pupil school.

4. And finally, it is recommended that a future study of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education concern itself with the professional education of teachers in Wisconsin. Time and resources spent on cooperative efforts to improve teacher education programs including provisions for clinical experiences, internships, research and experimentation would be very valuable and would make possible an assessment of the remaining campus schools in the context of the institutional programs they support.

This is a time of great change in teacher education. Vigorous forces are operating to bring about new demands and new means for meeting them. The cumulative effect of such influences strongly supports the need for fundamental rethinking of teacher education programs.

A major influence is the development of differentiated staff assignments in the elementary and secondary schools. Paraprofessionals of various competencies and levels of responsibility are being introduced into the schools. The organization of teaching teams has resulted in varying specialized assignments for team leaders, master teachers, associate teachers, and area teachers. Other types of specialization are also beginning to develop; some of them are related to recent studies of teaching styles. Much greater differentiation and individualization of teacher education programs are certainly indicated as well as development of appropriate types of preparation for new instructional and supporting roles.

A recent publication entitled Men, Media and Machines[53] links the development of a differentiated staff to the increase in

---

[53]Bruce Joyce, Men, Media and Machines, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1967).

technological devices which radically change the nature of many of the tasks the teacher must perform. The technological revolution is not only influencing the teacher's role, however, but, as has been said, it is making possible many new techniques in the program through which teachers are prepared.

Related to the increasing use of media is the current research interest in the analysis of teaching which has led to the development of tools for recording and classifying various aspects of classroom behavior. The importance of such analytic tools in the process by which the teacher develops goal behaviors, plans teaching strategies and evaluates feedback on performance is becoming increasingly evident.

Perhaps the most important factor influencing the need for change in teacher education programs at the present time, however, is the recognition that the liberal and professional education of a teacher cannot be accomplished in four years of post-secondary schooling. In fact, the notion of putting a prospective teacher through a prescribed sequence of courses and laboratory experiences and then pronouncing him a finished practitioner has been completely discredited. Concepts of internship, team teaching, pretenure supervision of beginning teachers and continuing education for career teachers are becoming increasingly widespread. A teacher education program must in the future discard the idea of preservice and in-service professional preparation and deal with the total range of educational experience--a necessity that requires increasing cooperation among all institutions and organizations concerned with the education of teachers.

In Wisconsin the potential for such coordinated effort exists with an extensive system of state-supported universities, an involved and active State Department of Public Instruction and many public school systems with some experience in cooperative enterprises. The leadership of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in bringing these resources together in a broad-based response to the challenge of the times to teacher education seems not only appropriate, but vitally necessary.

A recommendation for an examination of teacher education programs as an outgrowth of a study of university campus

schools is logical in the context of the major thesis of the report: the campus school can be considered only in relation to its contribution to the program of teacher education of which it is a part. Such consideration may lead to difficult decisions. It is never easy to make changes in a valued tradition. The procedures suggested here would make it seem possible, however, to make such a decision, if it has to be made, for relevant and institutionally acceptable reasons.

## APPENDIX A

### Inventory of Activities
### Laboratory School Teachers

1. Teaching assignment (grade level and/or subjects and hours per week). _____

2. Number of pupils in class. _____

3. Number of student teachers (e.g. One full-time; three for six hours a week . . . ) _____

4. Number of regularly assigned observers and participants (e.g. Six sophomore observers for two hours each week; three junior participants one hour a day . . . ) _____

5. Number of demonstration classes for university courses taught since September. _____

6. Number of college students who have visited your classroom individually or in small groups during the last five days. _____

7. Number of other visitors (teachers, college staff, parents, etc.) during last five days. _____

8. Please list meetings, conferences, committee meetings and other out-of-class commitments which have been part of your schedule during the last five days. _____

9. In what special projects (research, curriculum development or committee work) are you presently engaged? (If possible, give an approximation of hours per week devoted to each project). _____

10. Are you working toward an advanced degree or taking graduate courses? _____ . If so, for how many hours are you registered this semester? _____

    Questions or Comments: _____

## APPENDIX B

### Interview Guide for Deans and Presidents

I. Is there any information in the Coordinating Committees' report which you consider incomplete or misleading?

II. What do you feel your laboratory school ought to be doing during the next five years? What additional facilities do you feel will be needed to provide laboratory experiences for your students? To what extent should neighboring school systems be involved in supplying these facilities?

III. Looking at what seem to be current trends in teacher education, do you anticipate program changes which may make a radical difference in the facilities you may need in the future? If so, how?

IV. What is your candid opinion concerning the willingness and ability of neighboring school systems to increase substantially their participation in teacher education programs? Are there things they cannot, or will not, do?

## APPENDIX C

### Interview Guide For Campus School Staff

I. Aside from your work with children and youth, what do you consider the most important part of your work as a laboratory school teacher?

II. What things would you like to do that you don't have time to do now? (Query for specifics)

III. What would you like to have someone else do?

IV. What changes do you think are likely to take place in this state university and the laboratory school during the next five years? In what way would you like to participate in these changes?

## APPENDIX D

### Interview Guide for Professional Education Faculty

In what ways do you use the laboratory school for your research activities and/or your classes?

We all know, of course, that no *one* school, however good, can meet all your needs. What other resources do you have for providing for demonstration classes, observation, participation and research?

(Inquire, if necessary, about audio-recordings, closed circuit television, kinescopes, micro-teaching, simulation, experiences in community agencies).

What needs do you have in your present program which are not met by the laboratory school or the other means discussed?

What changes do you see in your needs in the future as a result of new developments in teacher education?

What ideas do you have about ways in which your present and future needs might be better met?

What kinds of contacts have you had with neighboring public schools recently? What could they do – or what would you like them to do – to provide experiences for your students?

Looking to the future what do you see as the unique and irreplaceable services to be rendered by the laboratory school?

## APPENDIX E

## OPINIONNAIRE

### Participation of Public Schools In Teacher Education Programs*

The questions in this opinionnaire refer to elementary grades only (K-8).

1. Name of School district _____
   Number of K-8 classrooms _____
   Distance (in miles) of most distant elementary or junior high school from university campus _____
   Enrollment K-8
   Number of teachers K-8 (full-time equivalency) _____
   Preparation:
   Less than AB _____ AB _____ MA _____
   Experience: Number of teachers with 3 years or more_____
   Number K-8 teachers administrator would designate as master teachers _____

2. Do you consider it appropriate to use public schools in connection with university teacher education programs of:
   Observation – demonstration Yes _____ No ____
   student participation Yes _____ No ____
   educational research Yes _____ No ____
   Comments _____

3. Would your schools cooperate with university staff to provide observation-demonstration opportunities:

| | | Estimated % of total classrooms that could be made available. |
|---|---|---|
| in classrooms | Yes ___ No ___ | _____ |
| in teachers meetings | Yes ___ No ___ | _____ |
| in other activities, such as conferences and extra curricular programs | Yes ___ No ___ | _____ |

   Comments _____

4. Would your school district authorize the conduct of case studies involving observations and use of school records

*NOTE—responses to this opinionnaire are intended to indicate the best judgment of the administrator at the present time. No commitment is intended and no response will be identified.

under controls worked out with university staff?
Yes _____ No _____
Comments _____

5. In cooperative planning of demonstrations by administrators, master teachers and professors, what limitations would need to be imposed:
   on schedule
   on choice of materials
   on teaching methods
   on use of videotaping and/or closed circuit television equipment in selected classrooms
   Comments _____

6. To cooperate with the university's research in education, indicate which of the following your school system could do:
   a. Designate one building as a research center sharing responsibility for staffing and classroom activities with the university.
   b. Designate a number of classrooms throughout the district for research. Staffing and control of activities and conditions in these rooms to be shared with the university.
   c. Arrange for occasional locating of special groups of pupils (with perhaps their teachers) in a special setting for a research venture.
   Comments _____

7. For pre-student teaching participation in such activities as teacher aide tasks, operation of equipment, and preparation of teaching materials, how many university students could your district accommodate (K-8):
   Five at a Time _____
   Ten at a Time _____
   Twenty at a Time _____
   _____ at a Time _____
   None _____
   Comments _____

8. Would your school system be able to designate one or more buildings as summer schools for the provision of student teaching, demonstration, experimentation, to be staffed and operated in cooperation with university staff? yes_No_
   Comments _____

9. What difficulties or special problems would have to be dealt

with in your system if cooperative arrangements such as have been suggested here were to be considered?
Comments _____

10. What advantages to your school system would you see in such cooperative arrangements?
Comments _____

# APPENDIX F

## Questionnaire for School District Administrators on Role of the Public School District In Student Teaching and Internships

Prepared by
Subcommittee of the Coordinating Committee for
Higher Education Advisory Committee on Laboratory Schools

David L. Bowman, Dean
Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh
Charles Jones, Supt.
Manitowoc Public School
(Chrmn.) Allen T. Slagle, Assist. Supt.
State Dept. of Public Instruction

This questionnaire is an attempt to get a realistic picture of the situation and potential in university-public school cooperation for provision of student teaching facilities. As a spokesman for the school system we hope each district administrator requested to complete this questionnaire will attempt to reflect the viewpoint of board members, teachers and parents.

1. In your opinion should public schools cooperate with university student teaching programs? Yes 64, No 0.
   Comments: _____

2. Should the school system reserve the right to limit the number of student teachers it accepts? Yes 64, No 0.
   Comments: _____

   2a. In most school systems, administrators have an approximate limit set to the number of student teachers they will accept at any one time. Please list the total number of faculty in elementary schools and in secondary schools and the corresponding approximate limit you would set for student teachers. (You may wish to check with building principals)

| | No. of Faculty | No. of St. Teachers |
|---|---|---|
| Sec. | 4,764 | 814 |
| Elem. | 5,785 | 973 |

   2b. In your school system do you have requests from

more than one college (public or private) to place student teachers with your faculty members? Yes 55, No 8.

Typically, how many colleges make requests? _____

Do you have to limit the number of colleges you can accommodate? Yes 17, No 46.

Do you occasionally get requests from different institutions for use of the same faculty members? Yes 34, No 29.

Do you have some priority system to aid in determining which institution you will accommodate? Yes 19, No 45.
Please Explain_____

2c. Has your school system reached the "saturation point" in terms of the number of student teachers it accommodates? Sec.. Yes 11, No 51, Elem. Yes 12, No 48.

How many student teachers are you accommodating this semester? Elem. 442, Sec. 543.

If you have not reached the "saturation point" indicate about how many more you could accomodate? Elem. 506, Sec. 421.

3. Do you feel that the Boards of Education with which you have associated have generally favored school system policies to govern the number of student teachers accommodated and the conditions under which they may be accommodated? Yes 42, No 16.

3a. Has a Board of Education with which you have worked ever refused acceptance of student teachers from all institutions? Yes 5, No 58,
From particular institutions? Yes 4, No 48.

3b. Has a Board of Education with which you have worked ever requested the curtailment or reduction of numbers of student teachers to be accommodated? Yes 8, No 55.

3c. Would you comment on the experiences you have

had with board member opposition to student teaching programs.

3d. Would you briefly explain the board policies now governing the number of student teachers accommodated and the conditions under which student teachers may be accommodated?

4. In your opinion do parents generally support the idea that public schools should accommodate student teaching programs? Yes 50, No 5.

4a. Have you or your administrators and teachers experienced negative parent reaction to a student teacher or the student teaching program? Yes 26, No 37.
If yes, comment briefly on the kinds of concerns parents expressed.

4b. Has such reaction ever resulted in the removal of a student teacher? Yes 10, No 46.
Would you estimate the number of such cases in the last 3 years. _____

4c. Has such reaction ever resulted in curtailment or modification of the student teaching program?
Yes 3, No 51.
Explain briefly. _____

4d. Have you found explanation of policy, procedures, controls, etc., to be effective in offsetting negative parent reaction? Yes 37. No 0.
Comments: _____

5. In your opinion is it possible that parent and community negative reaction to a student teaching program could result in a board of education curtailing or even closing out a particular student teaching program in its school system? Yes 47, No 15.
Comments: _____

6. In your opinion is it possible that requests of teacher bargaining agencies (Ed. Assoc. or Union) regarding student teaching programs could result in a board of education curtailing or even closing out a particular student teaching program in its school system? Yes 47, No 10.
Comments: _____

7. In your opinion which of the following people should have the right to decline or accept an invitation to supervise a student teacher?
   1) The public school teacher on the basis of her judgment as to whether or not she is capable or has the time. Yes 62.
   2) the public school teacher's principal (or perhaps department chairman) on the basis of his judgement as to whether or not she is capable or has the time. Yes 58.
   3) the public school superintendent (or the supervisor he designates) on the basis of his overall judgment of the implications of the assignment for the good of the school system. Yes 57.

7a. In your opinion do *teachers* generally feel they should have the right to accept or decline if invited to supervise a student teacher? Yes 63, No 0.

7b. In your opinion do building *principals* (or perhaps *department chairmen*) generally feel they should have the right to decide whether or not one of their teachers should have a student teacher or how many student teachers should be assigned to his building? Yes 52, No 10.

8. In your opinion should public school teachers be provided special incentives for serving as a supervising teacher for a university? Yes 52, No 5.

8a. Should they be given a gratuity by the college? Yes 53, No 9.

8b. Should they be given extra remuneration by the school system? Yes 6, No 54.

8c. Should the school system give them released time — time from their teaching schedule for conferencing and doing the needed planning, analysis and evaluation tasks essential to a high quality student teaching program? Yes 26, No 31.

8d. Does your school system provide released time now? Yes 8, No 50.
If yes, explain briefly how this is provided.

8e. In your opinion do *teachers* feel they should have:
   1) a gratuity from the college Yes 59, No 2,
   2) extra remuneration by the school system Yes 16, No 39.

3) time from their teaching schedule to accomplish the additional work Yes 36, No 22.

8f. Do you think the State should provide aids to school districts to help pay for these costs? Yes 42, No 20.

8g. Are teacher bargaining agencies (local education association or teachers union) involved in suggesting special incentives or rewards for supervising teachers? Yes 5, No 56.
Comment: _____

9. On occasion a student teacher has a particular problem or represents a borderline case of admittance. In either situation the university or school system judges that he *might have, or is having,* a disruptive effect upon a particular public school situation. Should the school system be willing to work out the problem of giving him the special experience and guidance needed to bring him to an acceptable level of adequacy as opposed to this being the responsibility of the university before placing the student in a public school situation? Yes 21, No 32.

10. In your opinion should public school systems be willing to cooperate with university paid-intern programs? Yes 60, No 0.

10a. Should the school system reserve the right to limit the number of interns it can handle? Yes 64, No 1.

10b. How many paid-interns will you have in your school system this 1967-68 school year? Sec. 138, Elem. 83.

10c. Assuming the intern is receiving about $1500 per semester for approximately a 2/5 teaching load under careful supervision from one of your experienced teachers, about how many interns do you feel your school system can handle at one time?
Sec. 254 Elem. 253

11. How many teachers in your school system hold at least the master's degree and have at least three years of teaching experience, including one year in your school system?
Sec. Schs. 1,372
Elem. Schs. 626

12. How many teachers in your system hold at least the bachelor's degree and have at least two years of experience, including one year in your school system?
Sec. Schs. 3,078
Elem. Schs. 4,429

## APPENDIX G

### Results of a Questionnaire and Interview Instrument used with District Administrator and President of Teachers Association in School Districts where a Teacher Education Institution and a Campus Laboratory School are in Operation

Prepared by the
Subcommittee of the Coordinating Council for
Higher Education Advisory Committee on
Campus Laboratory Schools

This questionnaire and interview instrument was constructed to enable each community, through its district administrator and president of its teachers association, to react to the kinds of concerns and questions deans of schools of education and directors of campus laboratory schools might raise if activities now conducted in the laboratory school were to be replaced through the schools in the community where the college is located.

Questions and interview instruments were sent to eight State Universities operating a laboratory school and the University of Milwaukee. No response was received from the University of Milwaukee (this may have been due to the untimely death of Dean Himmelmann and changes in the administration of the School of Education). No report was received from Whitewater, although they conducted the interview. (Their report was mailed but never received.) Thus we have fourteen responses; seven are from district administrators and seven from presidents of teachers associations identified with the communities of Eau Claire, La Crosse, Oshkosh, Platteville, River Falls, Stevens Point, and Superior.

The procedure selected for reporting the results of the data is as follows. The questions as they appeared on the interview instrument will be listed, and the responses of superintendents will be listed; next to them and in parentheses, the responses of presidents of teachers associations will be listed. The reader can make analyses from direct observation of the data as received. A few summary comments however might be made.

**Summary Comments**

With regard to replacement by the public schools of those activities – observation, participation, controlled demonstrations, video-taping and research – now occurring in campus laboratory schools, it can be summarized that district administrators' and teacher association presidents' reactions suggest that these public school systems could not be depended upon to provide the

various activities *as needed.* As regards the extent to which the public school systems might provide controlled demonstrations, none of the teacher association presidents felt that they should be provided *as needed;* rather there was a high incidence of their responses and district administrators' responses in the categories indicating that controlled demonstrations should be provided on a *limited* basis or *not at all.* The responses in terms of the extent to which public school systems should provide for video-taping and research reflected a similarly high incidence in the *limited* or *no* category rather than the *as needed* category.

One of the types of questions asked dealt with anticipated parent and teacher reaction in the event the present, various, laboratory school activities be placed, a) in one or two public schools in the immediate proximity of the campus, and b) throughout all the schools in the district. The reaction of both groups to either situation was considerably more negative than positive in each area of campus laboratory school activities — observation, participation, controlled demonstrations, video-taping, research, and the summer session.

A series of questions was posed to ascertain how the public school program would compare with the campus laboratory school program if the public school system was to assume the functions presently being performed in the campus laboratory school. One portion of the questions dealt with restrictions, limitations and administrative controls. Respondents were asked to indicate *greater, same,* or *less* amount of restriction or limitation or administrative control in a public school rather than a campus laboratory school. Again, in all areas of consideration, the restrictions, limitations and administrative controls were judged generally to be greater in the public school situation. The other portion of the questions dealt with acceptance by building principals, acceptance by teachers, and acceptance by parents. Here, a considerably high incidence is seen in the responses *less acceptance by building principals, less acceptance by school teachers,* and *less acceptance by parents* if the public school was to perform the functions now performed by the campus laboratory school.

In summary, the responses from this questionnaire-interview instrument clearly support the contention that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to replace in the local school system all of the activities now being conducted in the campus laboratory schools. It might be argued that some of these could possibly be replaced in other school systems. Although this would be true for certain specific activities on limited bases it would not be for many, and certainly not for all. It could be argued further that perhaps the curriculum of the teacher preparation institution should be changed so as not to necessitate many of the activities that are now called for in the campus

laboratory schools. However, it would hardly seem appropriate for any group other than the duly authorized faculty groups on the respective campuses to suggest what specific curriculum experiences are to be employed at the various institutions. Most state institutions preparing teachers now enjoy excellent cooperative relationships with the local school system and other school systems in their respective areas. The removal of campus laboratory schools would place these relationships in serious jeopardy if the reactions of teacher association spokesmen and district superintendents are taken into consideration.

## APPENDIX H

### Questionnaire To Laboratory Schools

### "HOW ARE THE LABORATORY SCHOOLS USED?"

The information is to be based on data collected during the 1st and 2nd semesters of the 1966-67 school year as well as the 1967 summer session.

1. Number of college students enrolled in teacher education utilizing lab school

| | Utilized lab school | Not utilized lab school |
|---|---|---|
| Freshman | _____ | _____ |
| Sophomore | _____ | _____ |
| Junior | _____ | _____ |
| Senior | _____ | _____ |

2. Number of demonstrations performed (see definition)

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

3. Number of students observing the demonstrations

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

4. Number of Individual Observations (see definition)

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

5. Number of "participation opportunities"; i.e., active participation in the many phases of the learning-teaching situation, extended to pre-student teachers (see definition)

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem.s, | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

6. Number of appearances before university classes other than those that are part of the normal assignment

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

7. Number of "visits" by in-service teachers

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

8. Number of laboratory school faculty members involved in the public school in-service program (see definition)

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

9. Estimated number of laboratory school faculty hours involved in public school in-service programs

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

10. Number of "service" functions provided by lab school staff; i.e., PTA talks, etc. (see definition)

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

11. Do lab school faculty members advise college students? ____
Number _____ Average number of advisees _____

12. Do laboratory school faculty members teach college students? _____
If so, how many semester hours? _____

13. Does the laboratory school serve the college or school of education in some "special" or unique manner not indicated in the above? (i.e., advance planning with college method teachers) Yes _____ No _____
If so, describe the function.

14. Number of experimental or innovative projects conducted 1966-67 school term. _____
Number of staff hours devoted to the above

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

15. Number of research projects conducted 1966-67 school term in the Campus Lab School _____

16. Number of student teachers assigned to the lab school

| 1st Sem. and 2nd Sem. | SS | Total |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | ____ | ____ |

17. Please list:
(a) Staff publications (1960-67) (Please use accepted footnote form)
(b) Non-published projects taking place in the Campus Laboratory School

# APPENDIX I

## Questionnaire

To: Teachers of Courses in Professional Education

From: CCHE Advisory Committee on Laboratory Schools

We are soliciting your help in making a quantitative analysis of the contributions made by Campus Laboratory schools to the product of the teacher education program. Assuming observation demonstration, and participation to be the primary function of the Campus Laboratory School, please react to the following statements as indicated:

1. In a brief paragraph, give your opinion as to what degree access to a Campus Laboratory School provides assistance in bridging the gap between theory and practice as related to education procedures.

2. In a brief statement, give your opinion as to the degree that control of a program used for observation, participation and demonstration is necessary.

3. By circling the appropriate numbers on the next page, indicate your opinion of the extent to which a Campus Laboratory School contributes to the items listed.

### "CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL"

1. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Develop a set of basic notions pertinent to learning and to human growth.

   5 4 3 2 1
   A Great Deal Not At All

2. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Identify, understand, and accept individual differences among pupils.

   5 4 3 2 1
   A Great Deal Not At All

3. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Organize the classroom, utilize control techniques, and establish socio-emotional climate so that effective teaching-learning is enhanced.

   5 4 3 2 1
   A Great Deal Not At All

4. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:*

Understand the values and techniques of planning for teaching.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

5. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Make effective use of audio-visual and other teaching aids.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

6. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* See the curriculum as an entity and understands the scope sequence and function of all subjects including the specials such as art, music, and physical education.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

7. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Evidence skill in the measurements, evaluation, recording and reporting of pupil growth and achievement.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

8. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Utilize the school and community as resources for teaching-learning experiences.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

9. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Recognize the value of such groups as parent and/or student organizations dealing with school affairs and cultivates appropriate activity or involvement therein.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

10. *A Campus Laboratory School helps a prospective teacher:* Understand the role of an educator as a professional person.

5 4 3 2 1

A Great Deal Not At All

11. Name of Institution: _____

12. Assignment. Define your responsibility as it relates to the teacher education sequence. (Be Specific).

13. What percent of your total assignment is a part of the professional education curriculum as contrasted to an academic department?

# TABULATED RESULTS
## from

## Questionnaire and Interview Instrument

for use with
District Administrator and President of Teachers Association
in School Districts where a Teacher Education Institution
and a Campus Laboratory School are in Operation

Prepared by the
Subcommittee of the Coordinating Committee for Higher
Education Advisory Committee on Campus Laboratory Schools

David L. Bowman, Dean
Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh
Charles Jones, Superintendent
Manitowoc Public Schools
(Chm.) Allen T. Slagle, Assistant Superintendent
State Department of Public Instruction

This questionnaire and interview instrument is constructed to allow for the individuality of teacher education programs in institutions having campus laboratory schools. It is attempting to look at those functions now being carried out in the laboratory school and the implications (in the eyes of district administrators and teachers) for the local school system if the campus laboratory school was no longer in operation. All questions may not be equally applicable in each community where there is a campus laboratory school. The instrument does assume that most of the activities referred to would need to be conducted in the local school system where the university is located if there was no campus laboratory school.

The questionnaire and interview instrument should be used in two separate interviews conducted jointly by the Dean of the School of Education and the Campus School Director. One interview should be with the District School Administrator and one with the President of the local Education Association.

University _____ Name of Person being interviewed _____ Position ____

City in which University is located _____ Names of persons conducting interview _____ Position ____

## A OBSERVATION

**To the Interviewers**
The interviewers must describe the implications of each of the statements in terms of the particular university program involved – the number and frequency of such observations now and the potential in the future. For example, at Oshkosh in one year 6000 individual or group observations were *recorded* (many are not) and the orientation to education course alone could involve up to 9000 observations if only 6 per student were permitted.

(The comment area enables you to capture the important statements or concerns.)

Item 2 gets at University control of observation.

**Questions**

1. To what extent should this public school system provide individual or group observation opportunities (in accordance with the university teacher education program expectations and as replacement for the present observation activities available in the campus laboratory school) in connection with:

| | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) the various sections of professional education courses during accademic year | 3(2) | 3(4) | 1(1) |
| b) the various sections of professional education courses during summer session | 2(1) | 3(2) | 2(4) |
| c) individual student observation as directed by a professor, e.g. observe parent-teacher conference | 3(2) | 3(3) | 1(2) |
| d) in-service teachers who are on campus and observing as directed by a professor or their principal | 4(3) | 3(4) | 0(0) |
| e) individuals in attendance at conventions held on campus and involving observation | 2(2) | 2(3) | 2(2) |

Comments:_____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

2. To what extent should the public school system provide individual or group observation of:

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | any class selected by the university professor | 3(2) | 3(2) | 1(3) |
| b) | teacher meetings | 2(2) | 3(3) | 2(2) |
| c) | parent-teacher conferences | 2(1) | 3(1) | 2(5) |
| d) | individual pupils in and out of school | 2(1) | 4(4) | 1(2) |

Comments: _____

**Questions**

3. If university students were to make detailed case studies and analyses of public school pupils (in connection with college classes such as psych., sociol., etc.) what reaction might you anticipate from:

| | | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neutral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | administrators | 1(1) | 2(2) | 1(3) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| b) | teachers | 1(1) | 2(2) | 2(2) | 2(2) | 0(0) |
| c) | parents | 2(4) | 2(2) | 2(0) | 1(1) | 0(0) |
| d) | pupils | 0(1) | 2(3) | 4(2) | 0(0) | 1(1) |

Comments: _____

4. What parent or teacher reaction might you anticipate if the present university observation program was moved from the campus laboratory school and placed:

| | | Parent Reaction: Very Neg. | Neg. | Neutral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | in one or two public schools because of their proximity to campus | 1(2) | 2(3) | 2(2) | 2(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | thorughout all the schools in the district | 0(1) | 3(3) | 1(2) | 1(1) | 2(0) |

| | Teacher Reaction: Very Neg. | Neg. | Neutral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (a) | 1(3) | 3(3) | 1(1) | 2(0) | 0(0) |
| (b) | 1(2) | 3(2) | 0(2) | 2(1) | 1(0) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

**To the Interviewers**

Interviewers should describe the laboratory school program so that comparisons can be made. Consider the observation program in situations under university control and in situations under board of education control.

**Questions**

5. If this public school system was to assume the observation function presently performed in the campus laboratory school how would the public school program compare with the campus laboratory school observation program in terms of:

| | | Greater (than in a campus sch.) | Same | Less |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | restriction of numbers of observers | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| b) | limitation of professors prerogative | 5(7) | 1(0) | 1(0) |
| c) | administrative controls for scheduling and arranging observations | 4(5) | 3(2) | 0(0) |
| d) | restriction of the number of case studies made | 3(6) | 4(1) | 0(0) |
| e) | limitation of the detail of the case studies made | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| f) | acceptance by building principals | 0(0) | 3(2) | 3(5) |
| g) | acceptance by teachers | 1(1) | 2(0) | 3(6) |
| h) | acceptance by parents | 0(0) | 2(2) | 4(5) |

Comments:_____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

## B PARTICIPATION – OTHER THAN STUDENT TEACHING

**To the Interviewers**

The interviewers must describe the implications of each of the statements in terms of the particular university program involved. What kind of participation activities now go on in your laboratory school – during the year and in the summer? Which courses, undergraduate and graduate, now request participation experiences of students? Do or should your interns have participation opportunities during the junior year and/or during the summer before interning. At Oshkosh, for example, some 50 interns get junior year and summer session experience in the laboratory school.

**Questions**

Participation activities usually refer to a host of first-hand

experiences with pupils that take place in a classroom situation or in out-of-class situations prior to student teaching. In many cases these participation activities of university students must be worked into the students' class schedule and therefore must be provided in a school setting in proximity of the campus.

1. To what extent should this public school system provide participation opportunities (in accordance with the university teacher education program expectations and as replacement for the participation activity presently available in the campus laboratory school) in connection with:

| | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) utilization of audio-visual equipment | 3(3) | 3(2) | 1(2) |
| b) small tasks about the classrooms | 3(4) | 3(3) | 1(0) |
| c) activity in the recess, lunch, before and after school programs | 3(4) | 3(3) | 1(0) |
| d) research endeavors of faculty members in a research center | 2(2) | 3(3) | 1(2) |
| e) working in the building after school hours on bulletin boards, materials, preparation, etc. | 3(4) | 3(1) | 1(2) |

Comments: _____

2. Some university programs require a junior year participation experience in the campus laboratory school for prospective interns. Such an experience needs to be fit into the student's schedule and represents a special assignment different from those typically given in student teaching

| | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| To what extent should this public school system provide such pre-intern participation experiences? | 3(3) | 4(4) | 0(0) |

Comments: _____

Note — Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers association.

**Questions**

3. What parent or teacher reaction might you anticipate of the present university participation program was moved from the campus laboratory school and placed:

| | | Parent Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| a) | in one or two public schools because of their proximity to campus | 1(2) | 3(3) | 2(2) | 1(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | throughout all the schools in the district | 1(1) | 2(3) | 2(2) | 1(1) | 1(0) |

| | Teacher Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| a) | 1(2) | 3(4) | 1(1) | 2(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | 1(1) | 2(4) | 1(1) | 2(1) | 1(0) |

Comments: _____

4. If this public school system was to assume the participation function presently performed in the campus laboratory school how would the public school program compare with a campus laboratory school participation program in terms of:

| | | Greater (than in a Campus School) | Same | Less |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | restriction of numbers of participants | 5(7) | 2(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | limitations of type of activities | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| c) | administrative controls for making participation arrangements | 5(4) | 2(3) | 0(0) |
| d) | acceptance by building principal | 1(0) | 2(2) | 4(5) |
| e) | acceptance by teacher | 0(0) | 3(2) | 4(5) |
| f) | acceptance by parents | 1(0) | 2(1) | 4(6) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

## C CONTROLLED DEMONSTRATIONS

**To the Interviewers**

The interviewers must describe the implications of each of the statements in terms of the particular university program involved – the number and frequency of such controlled demonstration and the potential. Don't overlook the undergraduate, graduate, extension courses or the workshops, institutes, and other than class demonstration needed now, and in the future, Oshkosh, for example, has about 80 sections of courses each semester that call for 12 lab. periods of which some or all could be controlled demonstrations. This represents a potential of 960 controlled demonstrations per semester.

**Questions**

The controlled demonstration is a pre-arranged teaching situation

where a university professor in connection with any one of the professional education courses (and sometimes other courses) specifies what he wishes a *master* teacher to teach and how he wishes it taught for him and for his class (of up to 30 or 40 students). This usually involves a conference between the professor and demonstration teacher beforehand and a critique with the university class at its next scheduled meeting *on campus* involving the teacher and professor. It also involves setting the demonstration time in accordance with the university class schedule and must be in a school close enough to campus so that students may move from classes to the demonstration and back to classes.

1. To what extent should this public school system provide controlled demonstrations (in accordance with university teacher education program expectations and as replacement for the activities presently available in the Campus Laboratory School) in connection with:

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | professional education courses during academic year | 2(0) | 2(4) | 3(3) |
| b) | professional education courses during summer session | 2(0) | 1(2) | 4(5) |
| c) | other courses than those in education | 1(0) | 2(3) | 4(4) |
| d) | courses scheduled when public school classes not in session | 1(0) | 1(3) | 4(4) |
| e) | conventions, clinics, institutes, workshops, conducted on campus or on occasion out of the city | 2(0) | 2(3) | 3(4) |

Comments:

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

**To the Interviewers**

The central concerns of the teacher education institution are: controls over setting up the demonstration, cooperation from demonstration teachers, and freedom from outside interference.

**Questions**

2. To what extent should this public school system allow the university instructor in connection with a controlled demonstration

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | selected the teacher | 3(0) | 1(3) | 3(4) |
| b) | determine the subject matter content to be taught during the demonstration | 3(0) | 0(2) | 4(5) |

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c) | determine the methodology to be employed by the master teacher | 2(0) | 1(2) | 4(5) |
| d) | determine the environment of the room within, of course, its physical limitation | 3(0) | 0(3) | 4(4) |
| e) | determine the materials (books, equipment, etc.) and outside resources to be used | 1(0) | 1(1) | 4(6) |
| f) | determine non-class demonstrations; e.g., teacher-pupil conferences, staff meetings, parent-teacher activities | 3(0) | 1(1) | 3(6) |

Comments: _____

3. What parent or teacher reaction might you anticipate if the present university controlled demonstration program was moved from the campus laboratory school and placed:

| | | Parent Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| a) | in one or two public schools because of their proximity to the campus and with the *master* teachers to teach in these schools being selected by the university | 3(2) | 2(2) | 1(3) | 1(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | throughout the school system (if feasible) but with specific *master* teachers being identified as those where demonstrations would be performed | 1(2) | 2(2) | 0(2) | 3(1) | 1(0) |

| | Teacher Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| (a) | 1(2) | 3(5) | 2(0) | 1(0) | 0(0) |
| (b) | 1(4) | 2(1) | 2(1) | 2(1) | 0(0) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

**To the Interviewers**

A *master* teacher in a lab. school usually has M.A. plus many credits, about 10 years of highly successful public school teaching and supervisory experience.

**Questions**

4. If this public school system was to assume the controlled-

demonstration function presently performed in the campus laboratory school, how would the public school program compare with the campus laboratory school controlled-demonstration program in terms of:

| | | Greater (than | Same in a lab. sch.) | Less |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | restriction of numbers of demonstrations | 5(6) | 2(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | limiting professors' control of content | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| c) | limiting professors' control of method | 4(6) | 2(1) | 1(0) |
| d) | limiting professors' control of class environment | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| e) | limiting professors' control of materials and resources | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| f) | limiting professors' selection of non-class demonstrations (parent-teacher conf.) | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| g) | restriction of joint planning by *master* teacher and professor | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| h) | restriction of *master* teacher critiquing with university class | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| i) | restriction of *master* teacher and children demonstrating outside of school hours and on Saturday | 7(6) | 0(1) | 0(0) |
| j) | restriction of *master* teacher and children demonstrating before audiences on campus and on occasion out of the city | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| k) | administrative controls for scheduling and arranging controlled demonstrations | 5(5) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| l) | limitation of facility or ease by which students and professor could arrange for, get to, and have critiques of, the demonstrations | 5(6) | 2(0) | 0(1) |
| m) | acceptance by building principals | 0(0) | 3(1) | 4(6) |
| n) | acceptance by teachers | 0(0) | 2(1) | 5(6) |
| o) | acceptance by parents | 0(0) | 2(1) | 5(5) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

## D VIDEO-TAPING

**To the Interviewers**
In the campus lab. school video-tape teams are free to go in to any classroom and plan and carry out filming activities. Lab. school teachers and pupils are accustomed to this and cooperation can be expected.

How many professional education sections (undergraduate, graduate, day, night, summer) might be interested in doing some micro-teaching? How about micro-teaching demonstrations for clinics, workshops, institutes, etc.?

**Questions**
Most university laboratory schools now own or are getting quality video-tape equipment. This provides many opportunities for bringing the finest produced in the laboratory school to thousands both on and off campus. It also contributes to innovative teaching approaches, to micro-teaching by university students and to research efforts on the campus.

1. To what extent should this public school system allow university professors to video-tape public school situations (in accordance with the university teacher education program expectations and as replacement for the filming opportunities presently available in the campus laboratory school) in connection with:

| | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) classroom situations where teacher behavior and pupil behavior are captured on film and studied, analyzed, and discussed by university classes, clinics, workshops, etc. | 2(0) | 3(4) | 2(3) |
| b) out-of-class situations where pupil behavior is filmed, studied, analyzed, and discussed by university classes, clinics, etc. | 2(0) | 3(3) | 2(4) |
| c) other public school activities – teacher meetings, teacher-pupil conferences, discipline problem situations again for analysis purposes | 2(1) | 2(3) | 3(3) |

Comments: _____

2. To what extent should this public school system free small groups of pupils at various age levels to visit university

classrooms where they would be used in connection with micro-teaching activities.

(Micro-teaching is having college students video-taped in teaching episodes with small groups of children for short periods of time so that immediate analysis of the episode can take place)

Comments: _____

Note — Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

**To the interviewers**

Campus school administrators, parents, and teachers are accustomed to the "gold fish bowl" nature of the operation. Would, or could, their counterparts in the public schools be as free to put themselves on display on a continuing and widespread basis?

**Questions**

3. If this public school system was to provide the situations for video-taping now provided, or to be provided, by the campus laboratory school how would the public school program compare with a campus laboratory school video-taping program in terms of:

| | | Greater (than in a lab. sch.) | Same | Less |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | restriction on amount of taping | 5(5) | 2(2) | 0(0) |
| b) | restriction on what is taped | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| c) | restriction on who is taped | 6(7) | 1(0) | 0(0) |
| d) | restriction on how tape is used | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| e) | administrative controls for accomplishing taping | 4(5) | 3(2) | 0(0) |
| f) | limitation of making pupils available for micro-teaching in university classes | 5(6) | 2(1) | 0(0) |
| g) | acceptance by building principals | 0(0) | 3(1) | 4(6) |
| h) | acceptance by teachers | 0(0) | 3(1) | 4(6) |
| i) | acceptance by parents | 0(0) | 1(1) | 6(6) |

Comments: _____

4. What parent or teacher reaction might you anticipate if the present and envisioned university video-taping function was moved from the campus laboratory school and placed:

| | | Parent Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| a) | in one or two public schools because of their proximity to campus | 2(2) | 2(3) | 3(2) | 0(0) | 0(0) |
| b) | throughout all the schools in the district | 2(3) | 1(2) | 1(1) | 3(1) | 0(0) |

| | Teacher Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| (a) | 2(3) | 2(3) | 2(1) | 1(0) | 0(0) |
| (b) | 2(3) | 1(3) | 1(0) | 2(1) | 1(0) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

## E RESEARCH

**To the Interviewers**

It should be emphasized here that more and more we hope to cooperate with school systems in research undertakings. However, it is extremely advantageous to any research undertaking to have a lab. school where pupils can be readily taken to a campus research center where sophisticated controls and measuring devices are in operation. The new education building planned at Oshkosh has such a center.

**Questions**

A rapidly expanding function of the campus laboratory school is that of research – research in the study of children, curriculum, teacher methodology. Some of the universities are adding School of Education buildings with rather sophisticated resarch facilities. The laboratory school can provide immediate access to experimental groups and greatly facilitate research design and control setting.

1. To what extent should this public school system provide research opportunities (in accordance with the teacher education program expectations and to replace those research facilities and pupil groups presently available in the campus laboratory school) in connection with:

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | study of children | 3(1) | 4(5) | 0(1) |
| b) | changing curriculum for certain groups | 3(1) | 4(2) | 0(4) |
| c) | teacher methodology | 3(1) | 4(3) | 0(3) |

Comments: _____

2. To what extent should the public school system allow:

| | | Much | Some | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | the identification of one public school as a research center to be staffed and controlled by the university | 1(0) | 2(2) | 4(5) |
| b) | the identification of several classrooms throughout the system as reserach centers to be staffed and controlled by the university | 2(0) | 1(2) | 4(5) |
| c) | the university research program to control curriculum conditions – content, method, organization, environment, and teacher selection – for experiemental and control groups | 3(0) | 0(2) | 4(5) |
| d) | groups of pupils and perhaps their teacher to be placed in a campus research center when desired or needed by the university for a highly controlled research venture | 2(0) | 0(1) | 5(6) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.

## E RESEARCH (continued)

**Questions**

3. What parent or teacher reaction might you anticipate if the present and envisioned university research program was moved from the campus laboratory school and placed:

| | | Parent Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| a) | in one or two public schools because of their proximity to the campus and with the *master* teachers to teach in these schools being selected by the university | 1(2) | 2(2) | 2(3) | 1(0) | 1(0) |
| b) | throughout the school system but with specific research centers being identified. | 1(2) | 1(3) | 2(2) | 2(0) | 1(0) |

| | Teacher Reaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Neg. | Neg. | Neut-ral | Pos. | Very Pos. |
| (a) | 1(2) | 2(3) | 2(2) | 1(0) | 1(0) |
| (b) | 1(2) | 1(3) | 2(2) | 1(0) | 2(0) |

Comments: _____

4. If this public school system was to provide facilities for research activity now performed in, or in connection with, a campus laboratory school how would the public school program compare with that of a campus laboratory school research program in terms of:

| | | Greater (than in lab. sch.) | Same | Less |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | restrictions on curriculum changes for research purposes | 5(6) | 1(1) | 1(0) |
| b) | restrictions on university selection of centers and staff | 4(6) | 3(1) | 0(0) |
| c) | restrictions on individual groups of pupils and their teacher being placed in a university campus research center | 5(6) | 1(1) | 1(0) |
| d) | acceptance by principals | 1(0) | 3(1) | 3(6) |
| e) | acceptance by teachers | 1(0) | 3(1) | 3(6) |
| f) | acceptance by parents | 2(0) | 2(1) | 3(6) |

Comments: _____

Note – Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations

## F SUMMER SESSION ACTIVITIES

**To the Interviewers**

The interviewers should describe the magnitude of the summer programs showing the number of students and the wide variety of activities involved. For example, Oshkosh has handled up to 200 teachers, and 50 interns, in one summer session. Observations are estimated to number well over a thousand and controlled demonstrations might be requested for up to 25 class sections of 30 students each per week. In addition attention must be given to research.

**Questions**

Teacher preparation requires large university summer programs to accommodate teachers in the field at both undergraduate and graduate levels and increasing numbers of regular pre-service undergraduate students.

1. To what extent should this public school system provide summer session student experiences (in accordance with the university teacher education program expectations and as replacement for the present experiences available in the campus laboratory school)?

| | | As Needed | Limited | No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | summer school student teaching experiences handled in a workshop fashion and tied to campus course work | 1(0) | 5(4) | 0(2) |
| b) | summer student teaching experiences for interns | 1(0) | 5(3) | 0(2) |
| c) | summer observation and participation activity with "cutting edge developments in education" for large numbers of teachers in the field who are on campus | 1(0) | 4(2) | 1(4) |
| d) | summer school video-taping and micro-teaching activity | 2(0) | 4(3) | 0(3) |
| e) | controlled demonstration opportunities for all sections of courses requiring or desiring them | 1(0) | 4(2) | 1(4) |
| f) | special workshop and graduate program clinical experiences demanding specialized facilities and staff | 1(0) | 3(2) | 2(4) |
| g) | research activities in the summer or continuing from the regular year under highly controlled conditions | 1(0) | 4(2) | 1(4) |

Comments: _____

Note — Numbers listed (without parentheses) indicate responses received from district administrators. Numbers listed in parentheses indicate responses received from presidents of teachers associations.